DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 317 887 CG 022 399

TITLE	Educating America's Youth against Drugs: Federal Drug Abuse Education Strategy. Hearing before the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control. House of Representatives, One Hundred First Congress, First Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, DC. House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control.
REPORT NO	House-SNAC-101-1-9
PUB DATE	26 Jul 89
NOTE	123p.; Some pages contain small, light type.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; *Alcohol Education; Children; Drug Abuse; *Drug Education; Federal Government; *Government Role; Hearings; *Prevention
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 101st

ABSTRACT

This document presents witness testimony and prepared statements from the Congressional hearing held to review the federal drug abuse education strategy for educating American youth against drugs. Opening statements are included from presiding Congressman Charles Rangel and from Representatives Lawrence Coughlin, James Scheuer, Nita Lowey, Benjamin Gilman, and Bill Paxon. Testimonies are provided from these witnesses: (1) Lauro Cavazos, Secretary of Education; (2) Dick Hays, director for the Drug Abuse Prevention Oversight Staff in the Office of the Secretary of Education; (3) Laurey Stryker, the assistant commissioner of education for the Florida Department of Education; (4) William McCord, director of the Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse for the state of South Carolina and a member of the National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors; and (5) Edward Zubrow, the special assistant to the superintendent of the Philadelphia (Pennsylvania) Public Schools, on behalf of the Council of Great City Schools. Secretary Cavazos reviews accomplishments of the Department of Education drug and alcohol prevention strategy and discusses new initiatives of the Department. He notes that the Department of Education supports efforts by states and local communities by providing leadership, disseminating information, and providing technical and financial assistance. Each of these areas is covered in Secretary Cavazos' statement. (NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EDUCATING AMERICA'S YOUTH AGAINST DRUGS: FEDERAL DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION STRATEGY

ED317887

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED FIRST CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

JULY 26, 1989

Printed for the use of the
Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control

SNAC-101-1-9

CG022399

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
24-274 WASHINGTON : 1989

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

(101st Congress)

CHARLES B. RANGEL, New York, *Chairman*

JACK BROOKS, Texas
FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK, California
JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York
CARDISS COLLINS, Illinois
DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii
FRANK J. GUARINI, New Jersey
DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
WALTER E. FAUNTROY, District of Columbia
WILLIAM J. HUGHES, New Jersey
MEL LEVINE, California
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas
LAWRENCE J. SMITH, Florida
EDOLPHUS "ED" TOWNS, New York
JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR., Ohio
KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
JOSEPH E. BRENNAN, Maine
NITA M. LOWEY, New York

LAWRENCE COUGHLIN, Pennsylvania
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
MICHAEL G. OXLEY, Ohio
STAN PARRIS, Virginia
F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., Wisconsin
ROBERT K. DORNAN, California
TOM LEWIS, Florida
JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma
WALLY HERGER, California
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut
BILL PAXON, New York
BILL GRANT, Florida

COMMITTEE STAFF

EDWARD H. JURITH, *Staff Director*
ELLIOTT A. BROWN, *Minority Staff Director*

(II)

CONTENTS

	Page
Opening statement of Hon. Charles B. Rangel, U.S. Congress	1
Opening statement of Hon. Lawrence Coughlin, U.S. Congress	2
Opening statement of Hon. James H. Scheuer, U.S. Congress	3
Opening statement of Hon. Nita Lowey, U.S. Congress	4
Opening statement of Hon. Benjamin Gilman, U.S. Congress	5
Opening statement of Hon. Bill Paxon, U.S. Congress	6
Testimony of Lauro F. Cavazos, Secretary of Education	6
Testimony of Dick Hays, Director for the Drug Abuse Prevention Oversight Staff in the Office of the Secretary	13
Testimony of Laurey T. Stryker, assistant commissioner of education, Florida Department of Education	34
Testimony of William J. McCord, director, Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse, State of South Carolina and member, National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors	37
Testimony of Edward Zubrow, special assistant to the superintendent, Philadelphia Public Schools, on behalf of the Council of Great City Schools	41
Prepared statements:	57
The Honorable Charles B. Rangel	62
The Honorable Lawrence Coughlin	63
The Honorable James H. Scheuer	65
The Honorable Lauro F. Cavazos	80
Laurey Stryker	90
William J. McCord	109
Edward Zubrow	

EDUCATING AMERICA'S YOUTH AGAINST DRUGS: FEDERAL DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION STRATEGY

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 1989

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 9 a.m., in room 2237, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Charles B. Rangel (chairman of the select committee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Charles Rangel, James Scheuer, William Hughes, Solomon Ortiz, Edolphus Towns, Nita Lowey, Lawrence Coughlin, Benjamin Gilman, Michael Oxley, James Sensenbrenner, Tom Lewis, Wally Herger, Bill Paxon, and Bill Grant.

Staff present: Edward H. Jurith, staff director; Elliott A. Brown, minority staff director; James Alexander, professional staff; Richard Baum, minority professional staff; Austin R. Cooper II, professional staff; George R. Gilbert, staff counsel; Rebecca L. Hedlund, professional staff; Michael J. Kelley, staff counsel; Robert S. Weiner, press officer; Melanie T. Young, minority professional staff.

Chairman RANGEL. Mr. Secretary, I apologize but we had a vote, not too important, but a vote on the journal on the floor. The Select Narcotics Committee will come to order as we continue to review the Federal strategy for drug abuse education.

Several weeks ago, the select committee met privately with our distinguished Secretary of Education. At that time, he agreed to appear before the committee to outline publicly the strategy that his department is pursuing to educate our Nation's youth against the dangers of drugs.

Mr. Secretary, we certainly welcome you back. Until today, Secretary Kemp, the Secretary of HUD, has been the only other Cabinet member to testify before our committee in order to discuss what the national drug strategy is, and he shared with us his plans to rid public housing of the scourge of drugs.

We commend you for your understanding and your sensitivity to the drug problem, not just to chemical dependence, but in recognizing that children have to live in a drug-free environment in order to reach their full potential in terms of education.

Some of us, not all on this committee, believe that we should not be waiting for the Drug Director, Secretary Bennett, to reveal his broad drug policy. Some of us believe that we created this position

for the Secretary to coordinate the drug policies as the leaders of our Nation's Cabinet positions would enunciate them. So, we had thought that the Secretary of Health and Human Services would have a plan for drug abuse treatment, and the Secretary of Education for education, and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for eliminating drugs from public housing. Then the coordinator would try to share with us what is working, what is not working. In any event, it appears to this member that whatever policies we have, they have been put on hold, waiting for Secretary Bennett to share with us the tablet that he's going to bring to us from on top of the mountain.

But, in the Congress, in the 1986 and 1988 Antidrug Abuse Acts, we thought that we had some ideas. We don't take pride in authorship of those ideas. Many of us felt that although the previous administration thought of these problems as local and State in nature, we thought they were national and important. Most of them, I think, were good ideas. Some were bad ideas, but that's for the Cabinet officials to evaluate as they relate to their departments, and single out those that work, ask that we revoke and change those that are not working, but, more important than anything else, to come forward with their own ideas as to what role their departments will play, or are playing, in this war against drugs.

We can't win this beating up on the Mexicans, and the Peruvians, and the Bolivians, even though we hope that we will see illicit narcotics production involved in our foreign policy. We can't win this war calling out the Marines, even though we hope the Department of Defense will share their technology to protect our skies and our borders from the intrusions of drug smuggling ships and planes. We can't win it just in Housing and Urban Development, Education, and treatment, but together I am confident that we have the resources in this great Nation, once we engage our generals in the Cabinet to support the President as he declares war, to win.

So, Mr. Secretary, we welcome your presence here to share with us the strategy that you have for your department in leading this Nation in the area of education, so that our children one day can hope that we can live in a drug-free society.

[The statement of Chairman Rangel appears on p. 57.]

Chairman RANGEL. Mr. Coughlin?

Mr. COUGHLIN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I am delighted to welcome Secretary Cavazos to the committee and to this morning's proceedings. I know that he shares our very strong commitment to educating our young people to say no to drugs, and carrying that message to both our schools and our workplaces, and shares our belief in that.

I will have to absent myself for about a half an hour shortly to present the transportation appropriations committee bill to the full committee, but I will be back immediately after that.

I'm certainly one who believes that we have to pay very special attention to programs directed at domestic demand for illegal drugs, particularly, education. For too long, not enough has been done to stem the demand here at home. Any drug education is, in

my belief, the single best means to reduce the consumption of illicit drugs and the drug crisis that's enveloped the nation.

Last fall, I know that the Department of Education, under your leadership, sent more than 125,000 antidrug videotapes to every public school district in the Nation for use by elementary and secondary schools, and I'm proud to have had a part in this program, and it was intended to provide youngsters with information about alternatives to drug use and ways to combat peer pressure. I think these audio visual programs make a viable contribution to decreasing the demand for drugs in this country and should be utilized wherever possible.

I understand the Department is in the process of developing some additional sets of audiovisual aids that will be targeted to inner-city schools and to Hispanic speaking populations, and I commend you for that.

I know the tragedy of drug abuse has brought death and despair to too many families across our Nation, and we've got to dedicate the best minds we have and precious resources towards teaching the next generation of American youth to reject drugs. There's no more important battle, in my judgment, than the war against drugs, and that struggles take place in the classroom and the workplaces as we try to teach our children and our people to abstain from drugs.

I look forward to hearing from you, Mr. Secretary. We look forward to working with you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The statement of Mr. Coughlin appears on p. 62.]

Chairman RANGEL. Is there any member seeking recognition for the purpose of making a brief opening statement? Mr. Scheuer.

Mr. SCHEUER. Very brief opening statement, Mr. Chairman.

To Secretary Cavazos, I think this session with you, and what you have to tell us, is the single most important briefing session we will have this session of Congress.

I support efforts at eradication of drugs overseas. I support efforts at interdiction of drugs into our country, but I don't hold out a great deal of hope for their success. I've been on this committee for 15 years, and every year since I became active we have heard first from the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and now from the Drug Enforcement Administration, we've heard, yes, we're picking up 5 or 10 percent of the drugs that come in. So, the drug lords simply shove another 5, or 10 or 15 percent into the pipeline as a cost of doing business.

The only hope, in my opinion, of making an impact on our drug scourge throughout this country, and our cities, and even in rural areas, is through education, education, education, education. It's the only hope. It's the last clear chance for a whole generation of youth and for our cities.

So, what I hope we'll hear from you is, what kinds of drug education programs work. I think it's very difficult to wean kids away from drugs. It's difficult to inform their parents. Their parents are very reluctant, many of these low-income minority parents, even to come to the schools.

What has worked in the past? What kind of research efforts are you planning to indicate what works in the schools, what will work

in the future? I think we are going to have to do a lot of probing, and testing, and thinking, and trying of different options, different alternatives, to see what actually does work.

I hope you will tell us what you are planning on two fronts. First, to reach the dropouts, to prevent dropoutism. What are you doing in the Department of Education to prevent dropoutism? And, what are you doing before that to provide a head start experience, an enriched preschool experience for every kid who is at education risk?

I have heard from some that that's a responsibility of the Department of Health and Human Services. Be that as it may, wherever it falls, it is a clear, indispensable precondition as far as education success is concerned for these kids who are at education risk who come from deprived homes.

Now, our country is only giving one out of six of those kids, who urgently need it, a chance for a preschool education, an enriched education experience, to make them learning ready when they get to the school house. I think that's a moral outrage for our country. When our President can ask for $70 billion for the B-2 bomber, and deny the one-tenth of that that would give a preschool enriched education experience for every child from the deprived home, an educationally deprived home, I think we've got our priorities mixed. I think we do more for our country's security by spending $7 million to give every kid at education risk a chance for a head start experience. And, we would spend 10 times that much on the B-2 Bomber.

I'm deeply grateful to you for being here. Tell us what you are going to do for drug education, what you are going to provide, what you are going to do for these two groups, the dropouts and the preschool kids at risk.

[The statement of Mr. Scheuer appears on p. 63.]

Chairman RANGEL. Ms. Lowey.

Ms. LOWEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to join you in welcoming the distinguished Secretary, who I have already had the pleasure of meeting as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

In addition, I want to join you in commending him for his demonstrated commitment to the issue of ridding our school of drugs.

Earlier this year, the select committee had the opportunity to meet with you to discuss your approach to the drug issue, and at that time you, Mr. Secretary, made clear your view, which I know is shared by the chairman and myself, that the widespread use of illegal drugs is the number one impediment to achieving the goal of an educated citizenry.

So, long as drugs are everywhere, in our communities, in our playgrounds, in our classrooms, we cannot hope to educate our youngsters for tomorrow. We can't hope to compete effectively in the global marketplace, and we can't hope to preserve the security of this Nation.

Further, the Secretary expressed the view that the most effective weapon we have against drug use is prevention. I share the Secretary's assessment. Certainly, we must pay attention to all elements of the national drug strategy, including interdiction, beefed up law enforcement and treatment programs, but we cannot underesti-

mate the impact and the contribution of drug education programs. We must pursue these programs which have demonstrated considerable success in both preventing and eliminating drug abuse among our Nation's young people.

To its credit, the Bush administration has requested an increase in funding for the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act. This is in sharp contrast to the last administration, which sought to slash an already underfunded program in half.

I was very pleased to learn that the Appropriations Committee yesterday reported a bill that appropriates the full amount of the administration request. However, I am still very concerned about whether we are meeting the enormous need that exists in my district and every other district throughout the Nation. Once funds under the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act are distributed to local education agencies, they are often of such limited size that they do not seem to be making a significant contribution.

I'm very interested in hearing the Secretary's comments regarding the implementation of this program at the local level, and whether we are achieving real results with what continues to be limited funding.

In addition, I'm very interested in learning what strategies are truly effective around the Nation, although the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act is relatively broad in scope, there may be strategies that we have overlooked or that deserve to be emphasized more than they currently are.

I welcome you. I look for your testimony with anticipation. Thank you very much for being here with us today.

Chairman RANGEL. Mr. Gilman?

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I welcome our good Secretary with us, and we look forward to a new approach to the drug problems with new leadership in the Department of Education.

In the past, our Department of Education has been criticized for too little leadership, too little funding, too little attention to some of the major problems in the urban areas, and too little new initiatives in trying to stimulate better prevention amongst our young people.

May of our law enforcement people tell us we haven't gone into the lower grades enough, that we start at a higher grade level, and have not really attacked the lower grade level where we should be influencing our children right at the start, and that there's too little teacher training out there. We've set up some training centers, but they are limited in scope and in regions, and that we should make that more available.

So, I want to commend our Secretary for his commitment to the issue, but I would hope that you would address these problems of lack of leadership, lack of funding, lack of commitment, lack of initiative in the past, so that we can properly address a problem that so many of our law enforcement people continually remind us of, that, yes, we must do a great deal more in enforcement, but we've done too little in reducing demand.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RANGEL. Mr. Secretary, we welcome your testimony—I'm sorry, Mr. Paxon.

Mr. PAXON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to join with my colleagues in commending you, Mr. Secretary, for your initiatives and your actions in the war on drugs, and certainly appreciate your being here today.

I look forward to talking with you today about schools without drugs, and the continuing activities of your Department in this regard, as we have talked with you in other places on the Hill this year.

But, Mr. Secretary, I would like to also say to you that as one member of this committee, and I can only speak for myself, I certainly look forward to your helping this Congress to help you, because Mr. Secretary, you, and the administration and the American people can't do it alone. We need help from this Congress, and I'm concerned, Mr. Secretary, that at times, this Congress seems to have no plan itself to fight the war on drugs. In this Congress, we are simply not living up to the law in regard to a drug-free workplace. Additionally, Mr. Secretary, I'm concerned that you have to appear before a proliferation of 53 congressional committees that have jurisdiction over drug issues.

I hope you'll help this Congress deal with these issues during the months ahead, and I appreciate your being here today and look forward to your testimony.

Chairman RANGEL. Mr. Secretary, you can proceed as you feel comfortable. Your entire statement will be entered into the record, and I hope you feel free to challenge this Congress. I will share with Mr. Paxon the 1986 and 1988 bills for him to review as it relates to our congressional role, but you should know that we expect the leadership to come from the White House, and we in the Congress are here to support that effort.

You may proceed.

TESTIMONY OF LAURO F. CAVAZOS, SECRETARY OF EDUCATION

Secretary CAVAZOS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I'd like to introduce Dick Hays, who is the Director of our Drug Abuse Prevention Oversight Staff, and he reports directly to me in the Department. In other words, that, in itself, is a statement of where we see his role and how important that is. So, I want you to get to know Mr. Hays. He's very, very knowledgeable, and we want to work together with you.

I have, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as I promised you at our last meeting some weeks ago, a very lengthy statement that we'll put into the record. This one does, Mr. Chairman, detail step by step what we hope to do.

Now, I just say that, because it's probably about a 20-minute statement, I don't want to take time from the opportunity for us to discuss and have the interchange that I want to have, and the guidance, and share some of our ideas with this committee. So, therefore, I'm going to give a very abbreviated statement, and if I may, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to enter this totality for the record.

Chairman RANGEL. With objection, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I thank you for inviting me, and I am pleased to have this opportunity to review

the accomplishments of our drug and alcohol prevention strategy, and to share our new initiatives with you. The Department of Education drug prevention strategy is designed to support and supplement the crucial role being played by states and local communities.

We provide the support in three vital ways, and here are the three ways: one, by leadership; two, by disseminating information, and, three, by providing technical and financial assistance. In my prepared statement, we go into great detail in each of those areas.

We move immediately to the implementation of the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act. We started that right away, and we sought technical amendments to increase the accountability of States expending funds appropriated under this act.

In the area of leadership, we worked to keep drug prevention issues in the public eye, and I must say that I've spoken frequently to educators, to parents, to students, to teachers, almost without exception as I give my talks throughout the Nation, I talk about the dangers of drugs and what we must do, people coming together to work in this area, because I really believe, members of the committee and Mr. Chairman, that we have to work together as a nation.

The first step that you have to take, at least certainly the way that I see it, is to raise awareness in this Nation to the seriousness of the problem. People say, yes, we are all aware of the problem, well, if they are that much aware we have been unable to focus and defeat that problem. So, I see part of our role in this Department as raising the awareness of the Nation to the seriousness of the problems we face in terms of the dangers of drugs.

Second, we must work together in this area by caring, by really caring. I think, you know, that may sound like apple pie and other things, but what I'm really getting at here is really caring when you do see that kind of a thing, caring when you know it's eating up in both the rural and in the urban areas, it's destroying our children, destroying minds, we must care as a nation about that and do something about it on every front.

Third, we must raise expectations of every citizen in this country that, yes, we can defeat the drug issue, but we must, fourth, work together and, therefore, that is why we come together here dealing with these very, very issues.

And, the Department continues to be in the forefront of Federal efforts to coordinate "demand reduction" activities by initiating and supporting combine efforts with other agencies and departments. I've stressed time and time again to our Department that we will work with every other department. It's not just the Department of Education working out here by itself, but we have relationships, certainly, with Health and Human Services, we have relationships with the Department of Labor, working in the same area, as well as with the drug prevention group.

Another major component of our leadership strategy is to create products that fill gaps in the available information about drug prevention, a drug prevention handbook for parents, and development of a model drug abuse prevention education curriculum are currently in preparation. The model curriculum will be issued in January 1990. Now, let me touch on that a moment, because several members of the committee did touch on some of the vital issues

and strategies that we have to put in place to defeat this scourge of drugs, and it really does start with childhood education. It really must start in totally educating our children about drugs and what they really mean.

Now, to do that, obviously, you have to bring in the parents and teachers, we have to prepare them to do this, so I asked, a few months ago, I asked our—in fact, I instructed our Department, develop a model curriculum that we can disseminate through every school in this country, that will start off the education of children back in grade kindergarten, and take them all the way through the 12th grade, not just as something that we're going to do, oh, we are going to talk about drugs, perhaps, once or twice a semester, but make it an integral part of education. I so much am convinced that if we are going to defeat this scourge it's going to be through education.

Now, that will be, that's moving ahead now, and we will have that curriculum ready. It is a model curriculum. We cannot impose a curriculum, and that's the way it should be, but we'll make sure that that reaches every school in this country, and we will urge that they use that curriculum.

The President and I have also proposed a major new initiative that would provide $25 million for a number of urban school systems with the worst drug problems.

The second part of our three-part strategy focuses on dissemination of information. Our dissemination activities include aggressive distribution of publications and videotapes that we have developed, already been remarked upon by members of this committee, as well as the distribution of information and development with other agencies and departments, and these include the publication, Schools Without Drugs, the Drug Prevention Curricula Guide, the Challenge Newsletter, a series of videotapes, a new parent handbook and model drug prevention.

In addition to this, we are preparing, of course, additional videotapes to be targeted more for the urban setting, as well as some of them being translated into Spanish, program abstracts for the drug prevention programs honored by Education's Drug Preschool Recognition Program are also being prepared for dissemination this fall.

Now, the third strategy. The Department provides technical and financial assistance to States and localities to ensure that their drug and alcohol prevention efforts are effectively designed, initiated and sustained. The major source of financial assistance is the State and local formula grant program. More than 81 percent of the funds available under the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act are distributed to the States based on school-aged enrollment.

Our other sources of financial support include several discretionary grant programs which funding, opportunities for State and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education and non-profit organizations.

Another element of technical assistance, our support of five regional centers for drug-free schools and communities.

The Department is also working with Health and Human Services, the Department of Transportation, to provide training to college administrators and counselors.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, the Department's drug and alcohol prevention programs are on track. We will continue to implement the strategy I've outlined. Drug prevention and education is a personal priority, as well as a departmental priority. The coordination of these efforts at the Federal level is critical, and I will be working with Director Bennett to implement the national strategy when it is released in September.

I'd be pleased to answer any questions or expand on my comments as you so direct, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

[The statement of Secretary Cavazos appears on p. 65.]

Chairman RANGEL. Mr. Secretary, I want to thank you for your testimony, and, certainly, you don't have to make any apologies for your position as it relates to caring and making people aware, because your background and experience dictates that you cannot educate unless you do deal with the other needs that children have.

And, that's why the Congress didn't pick you as leader. It's the President that said he wanted to be the Education Czar, and it just seems to me that that burden falls on you because he took up that national challenge.

We support our President, and, notwithstanding differences that we may have you can rest assured that we not only support you but invite our challenge to this Congress.

The only reservations that we have is that government might be so restrictive that they may not see education as broadly as you do, and that would be sad. But, what you are saying is that, children have to have an environment to learn.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Exactly.

Chairman RANGEL. It's not just the drug trafficker there, it's the housing conditions, it's the expectation, it's the family unit.

Yesterday, in front of this committee, we were dealing with drug rehabilitation. A man shared with us his program. It's located in Ms. Lowey's district, Westchester, the college surrounding, the children where blazers, coordinated clothes, beautiful surroundings, tutors. They may be rehabilitating them from drug abuse, but they are learning how to love, how to respect each other, self-esteem, they are learning how to pass tests, how to prepare themselves for college. They leave that place in two years somebody, notwithstanding the backgrounds that they come from.

Now, I just don't know what our restrictions are in Education. I know that most of the money is local and State, but you are respected internationally, and when you walk in and say this is what our government expects from you because we are engaged in the war, I would want to believe that state educational commissioners throughout the country, when they are asked by us as we ask them, what are you doing, they say we're following the lead of your Secretary of Education, because we are engaged in this war as well.

When we go to a rehabilitation center, and we say why are these people being discharged drug free but dumb and illiterate, we'd like to hear them say the Secretary of Education said we have to clean up our act, that rehabilitation means the mind has to learn to read and write, to be able to make a contribution.

I hope people aren't going to tell me that I have to go to the Attorney General. If I was to tell him that we in the State of New

York are paying $40,000 a year to house a prisoner, and we know that 70 percent of them when they are discharged are going to return within 3 years, and they discharge them, kick them out with a couple of dollars in their pocket, drug free. They can't read, they can't write, they can't do anything, the education is not there.

So, Mr. Secretary, could you share with me as to whether or not you think our role as Secretary is restricted to the Federal dollars that are in your budget, or will the presence of you being the Education Czar, if you will, I don't like the term but it's one that's used commonly now on the Hill, do you think that you have been given the responsibility to challenge any area where you don't see education working.

Mr. Scheuer was concerned about that kid dropping out of school, and I am too. He may not be in that structure, he may not be the recipient of a Federal dollar, but if he has dropped out of school for whatever purpose, is it in your program to pick him up, or to prevent him or her from dropping out?

Secretary CAVAZOS. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I agree 100 percent with your statement, and let me point out some areas and share with you my thoughts and philosophy, because you have opened up very broadly the whole issue of education.

I want to emphasize that as far as I am concerned education starts at birth, and stops when we quit breathing. To me, education is a totality of a lifetime that we learn every day, and to the most vital moments that we can really affect that early childhood time, I keep coming back to that point, because it is at this time that they develop self-esteem, and motivation and learn about themselves. I have said publicly, and I've said it in testimony before this Congress, that if we are to stem the dropout problem, it's going to start back up there in the early childhood days.

In the same way, Mr. Chairman, if we are to stem the drug problem, as supportive as I am of interdiction and in keeping the stuff out and all of the other, it is going to come about through education that starts in the early childhood time.

Therefore, I see us all—this is a continuum, do not separate drug education or drug problems from education itself. They are an integral part of that, just as so many times people have said to me, what has happened to our schools? Look at all the problems, that students aren't reading, grades are coming down, lack of discipline. Why? Oftentimes, there are some technical reasons, but most often it is because of social ills, the break down of the family, drugs coming into a school, the lack of caring by people. That's a very important part.

Therefore, I think that we have no boundaries. I see no constraint. We must open our mind as wide as we can, because anything that impacts the total education of a person, and I'm not talking just about children, I said "a person," is affected by this Department of Education, and we intend to do something about it.

Chairman RANGEL. Where is that blueprint, Mr. Secretary? We may not have the money that's necessary, but——

Secretary CAVAZOS. I think that——

Chairman RANGEL. [continuing]. But at least we could use that as a guide to see whether we can hold local and States accountable. In other words, we know there's a budget crisis, but if you could just

give us the blueprint as you professionally see it, and we'll work with Mr. Hays, we'll have him over to the committee room, we'll work with Gus Hawkins and Bill Goodling, across party lines, and to see what is feasible and what is not feasible.

We can't do all of the things that we would want to do. We can't give everyone that decent environment, and we can't feed parents when they don't have them.

But, if we could get that blueprint, I don't think we'll have a better Secretary of Education than you while I'm in this Congress, Mr. Secretary, but I do hope that you will give us that blueprint so that we can look at, see what we've got in the legislative calendar to do and what we can't do. I hope that you could point me in the right direction as to where that blueprint is, and if we don't have it, when can I expect it?

Secretary CAVAZOS. I think, Mr. Chairman, first of all, that you have that basically in this total statement, in terms of a blueprint. Now, we need to flex all of that out when we work together on those details, but recall that I started out with the issue of leadership, you know. You can say, well, leadership doesn't cost money. Well, you are so correct there, and we don't have any—we don't have a lot of dollars, but we must call attention to these problems and, therefore, we must bring about legislation, work with the Congress to prepare programs that will start affecting this drug issue.

Chairman RANGEL. Well, we've got you, we've got Mr. Bennett, and we've got President Bush. Now, that's enough leadership.

Secretary CAVAZOS. All right.

Chairman RANGEL. We've got that.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Yes, sir.

Chairman RANGEL. Now, what I would want from that leadership is a blueprint, and we've got Gramm-Rudman, and we've got a budget deficit, so we won't be able to get everything on your blueprint. But, point us in the right direction.

Mr. Paxon is concerned that the Congress should provide the leadership. Now, we've got more leadership than you can digest, 435 ideas on how to take care of this problem, and 100 others on the Senate side, but we've given you our feelings, take a look at it, analyze it, dissect it, give us your blueprint, and then from that, Mr. Hays, pull out of that the legislative part that we can implement.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Let me——

Chairman RANGEL. Then, we'll take it to our State houses around the country and say, this is a part of our national strategy.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Well, certainly, I think that we can start out by going back then to the point of leadership, and, basically, we're making it part of our effort to implement all legislation as quickly as we possibly can, and to put it into place.

Now, it is not enough to just simply get the legislation if we do not disseminate the information, get it effective and move it ahead.

But, I have to, I play a central role in the Department—focusing the activities of the Department—and by focusing that Department and saying, you are going to deal with the drug issue, build the strategies that will help us effect its education, I think that—now, I know that that's an important way of doing that.

But, the other thing that we have to do is, we have to collect information to understand the magnitude of the problem. I really still come back to the point that I made earlier about the role that I have, that I continue to do almost without exception when I make a speech, I will talk about drugs, the problems we are having there in that area.

We need to evaluate those programs that we have in place. What are the States doing? Because, part of our strategy is, therefore, to say, that is a successful one, and everybody needs to start looking at that thing.

I'm going to keep coming back to that model curriculum. I still believe that there you will find a step-by-step way of how schools can affect those issues. Now, that's just the model curriculum on that side, but the other side is, we're working with the universities and with the colleges because that's another large area where we have to have impact.

Beyond that, we certainly can—you know, we've talked about, we've prepared our videos, we've requested urban emergency grants, in addition to that we have a proposal before the Congress right now about merit schools. Now, people say, oh, you are just going to go out and reward all of these schools that have been doing a great job already. No; the merit school proposal that is the President's act is one that will reward schools that turn around the difficult issues such as drugs, and have a drug-free campus, and turn around the dropout issue, and turn around failing test scores and these kinds of things. So that, these are very specific strategies.

On top of that, we have almost $6 billion in our budget for the coming year, current year as well, dealing with what I'll put in the whole area of preventing dropouts. The very specific Chapter I programs, Chapter II programs, the drug programs, those are all laid out step by step, and we expend our dollars, and we expend them in a responsible way. So, there is a plan in place, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RANGEL. My time has expired, and the members have questions to ask, but the only thing I'm asking is, you are doing a great job all around the country, could you provide for this committee a blueprint as to the role of the Department of Education in the war against drugs? You have said it eloquently. I would like a blueprint, so that when you are not around we can point out, this is where we want to see our Nation go. It doesn't mean we have to assume all that responsibility. It may be in our jails, it may be in our treatment centers, it may be in our housing programs, maybe in our rural and urban developments, but I would like to see what you envision the role of Education in this war against drugs.

Mr. Gilman.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll try to be as brief as possible.

Mr. Secretary, you mentioned that you are going to spend some time in evaluating or gathering the facts on how extensive the problem is. I hope you don't waste too much of the Department's time in trying to determine whether this is a major impact upon the Nation. I think we've got enough statistics out there to determine that.

What we need now is more action and less studies, and I hope that you are going to be able to prod all of the agencies and all of the State departments into doing what has to be done.

Mr. Secretary, are you being consulted by Mr. Bennett's office with regard to the national strategy that's about to be unveiled for us?

Secretary CAVAZOS. Yes, Mr. Gilman, I've had a number of meetings with Mr. Bennett. On top of that, one of our responsibilities is to appoint a committee, what is the formal name of that committee?

Mr. HAYS. National Commission for Drug-Free Schools.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Okay, the National Commission for Drug-Free Schools. Mr. Bennett and I appointed that committee. Members of the Congress will also join that, and Mr. Bennett and I will chair or co-chair that committee.

Mr. GILMAN. Is that the National Commission that we adopted and mandated by the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988?

Secretary CAVAZOS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GILMAN. How far along is that now? Is that in place?

Secretary CAVAZOS. We have appointed the committee. Do you want to talk about that, Dick?

Mr. HAYS. Yes, sir. It's well——

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Hays, would you identify your title?

Mr. HAYS. Pardon, sir?

Mr. GILMAN. Would you identify your title?

Mr. HAYS. Yes.

I'm Dick Hays, and I'm the Director for the Drug Abuse Prevention Oversight Staff in the Office of the Secretary.

The preparation for the Commission is well underway. The Secretary and Director Bennett have appointed 16 members, and 14 of those have accepted to date. The Senate has appointed their four members. We are still awaiting the House of Representatives to appoint their four. We have heard from Speaker Foley that he intends to be at our first meeting, and that is planned for August 24.

Mr. GILMAN. August will be the very first meeting of this National Commission that we adopted last year?

Mr. HAYS. That's right, because the——

Mr. GILMAN. That's a long delay in getting this thing underway.

Mr. HAYS. It is somewhat of a delay, Mr. Gilman, but the law specified that the appointments were to be made jointly by the Secretary of Education and a Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, and until the confirmation for the Director was made, those two could not get together to make the appointments that the law specified.

When that was done, the Department of Education and Director Bennett's office moved swiftly.

Mr. GILMAN. The Commission was intended to be able to make recommendations to the Department, to the Secretary, with regard to how we should best address what is needed by way of criteria to be considered for drug-free schools, is that not so?

Mr. HAYS. The law specifies a number of things for the Commission to do, and you've outlined some of them, sir.

Mr. GILMAN. Will you be acting as sort of the Executive Director for that Commission?

Mr. HAYS. I will serve as the Secretary's representative. The Commission will have its own Executive Director.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Secretary, you mentioned that there is $6 billion in your budget for dropouts. I would assume that there is some sort of a relationship, a co-relationship, between the dropout problems and the narcotics problems, so you'll be spending a good chunk of that money in the same vain as we try to address some of these narcotics problems in the schools.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Yes, sir. When I mentioned the figure of $6 billion, actually, that's the bulk of our budget request for elementary and secondary education programs. These are tied so closely together, because, for example, in the Chapter I program there is over $4 billion in that alone that is used to help those children who are at risk and to support those programs that will help struggling children move ahead.

We've got $367 million for 1990 in the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act. I would include also the education for homeless children and youth. That's a State grant of over $4 million.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Secretary, forgive me for interrupting. Has there been any delay in the States making application for the monies that are available?

Secretary CAVAZOS. I think most of them have made their application. I think there may have been one or two that were a little bit slow.

Mr. GILMAN. There was a great deal of criticism when we looked at the budget for this year, as to whether there was unobligated funds in all of the agencies, and I think they pointed out to some of it being unobligated in the Education Department.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Would you touch on that, please?

Mr. HAYS. Yes, sir, I certainly will.

As we've discussed before, Mr. Gilman, we've noted that the committee's concern about the expenditure draw down rates by——

Mr. GILMAN. Could you put the mike just a little closer to you?

Mr. HAYS. Yes. Can you hear me now, sir?

Mr. GILMAN. Yes.

Mr. HAYS. I said, yes, we have noted your concern, and we have had our concern too about expenditure rate, and I think last time we talked we assured you that the States and the locals were moving at a reasonable rate in their expenditures.

Mr. GILMAN. How much is unobligated at the present time, Mr. Hays?

Mr. HAYS. We can provide that for——

Mr. GILMAN. Just what percentage, roughly, of the total funding that's——

Mr. HAYS. The total funding for fiscal year 1987, about 75 percent of the money has been spent. That report, of course, is accurate as of March 31, because that's the last reporting date.

For fiscal year 1988, the draw down at the March 31 period was approximately 35 percent.

Mr. GILMAN. Thirty-five percent halfway through the fiscal year, more than halfway through.

Mr. HAYS. Less than halfway, sir, because fiscal year 1987 money has to be spent before October 1, 1989. Fiscal year 1988 has to be spent before October 1, 1990.

So, we're talking about a March date, which is less than halfway along the way.

Mr. GILMAN. Is it moving slower or faster than in previous years? Where do we stand? Are we getting——

Mr. HAYS. Well, I think since we last talked, there are two interesting reports, one done by the General Accounting Office which is on the subject that we're talking about, and that's on the draw downs, and I'd like to——

Mr. GILMAN. What's the title of that report?

Mr. HAYS. It is the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986, Time Taken by States to Draw Down Formula Grant Funds.

Mr. GILMAN. What's the date of that report?

Mr. HAYS. June 1989. If I may, sir, I'd just like to quote the concluding paragraph of that report, because I think it provides perspective about what we're talking about.

The use of draw down data to measure the extent of activities under the grant program can be misleading. Draw downs have tended to understate program activity undertaking in the process of transferring Federal grant funds to the state. Thus, program activities may be well underway before the draw down request is made. That also reflects our experience when we monitor the states.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Secretary, with regard to the teacher training program, I note that about $7 million had been appropriated in fiscal year 1989. Is that sufficient funding for that kind of program, and how many of the teacher training areas do we have, the regional areas? First of all, is that sufficient funding to do what we want to do, in getting our teachers trained properly?

Secretary CAVAZOS. I really believe that the $7 million is sufficient funding. Certainly, I think that what we've been doing with it is trying to get it to spread throughout the Nation.

Mr. GILMAN. Well, have we spread that out pretty good?

Secretary CAVAZOS. Well, I really think that we can spread that out. "By spreading out," what I'm saying is, taking and preparing some teachers, and have them, in turn, prepare others, and move it throughout. We've had summer institutes for training of educational personnel in the implementation of these programs.

And, it's not just, when we talk about drugs, I want to make another point here, we are also including in this alcohol. We consider——

Mr. GILMAN. We recognize that.

Secretary CAVAZOS [continuing]. Any person less than 21, they really have an illegal drug.

Mr. GILMAN. Congress had authorized $20 million, you requested only $7 million, and I'm a bit concerned about whether there's sufficient funding out there to do the job that's required.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Well, we actually have two teacher training programs. There's one that's funded at $7 million, and then there's one at $13 million.

Mr. GILMAN. What's the difference between the two programs?

Secretary CAVAZOS. Do you want to touch on that?

Mr. HAYS. Yes.

Well, the first program was part of the original Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, and it was the break out in higher education. Half the money was to be spent for campus base programs, the other half was for teacher training in concert with local

school districts. And that, this year, is approximately at a $13 million level. In addition, Congress, as part of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, added a new teacher program, and that's the $7 million program that you and the Secretary have been talking about.

Mr. GILMAN. So, in the elementary and the secondary schools, roughly, how much money do you have available for teacher training all together?

Mr. HAYS. Well, that's hard to say. In these discretionary programs, as the Secretary indicated, there's $20 million.

In terms of the large——

Mr. GILMAN. There's——

Mr. HAYS. $20 million directly.

Mr. GILMAN. $20 million was authorized but not appropriated.

Mr. HAYS. Well, we're spending roughly at that level right now.

Mr. GILMAN. For teacher training?

Mr. HAYS. Pardon?

Mr. GILMAN. For teacher training?

Mr. HAYS. For teacher and professional training, professional educator training, yes. Mostly teachers, but it could be administrators, other educational personnel.

Mr. GILMAN. How many training centers do we have throughout the Nation right now?

Mr. HAYS. Pardon?

Mr. GILMAN. How many teacher training centers are there?

Mr. HAYS. We have, we are talking about our regional centers?

Mr. GILMAN. Whatever they are, regional, State?

Mr. HAYS. Well, we have five regional centers, which provide team training to schools and school districts.

Mr. GILMAN. Is that it?

Mr. HAYS. In addition, many States have their own training systems to provide training for teachers. In fact, one of the major——

Mr. GILMAN. Well, does the Department provide funding for the state training centers?

Mr. HAYS. The Department, that is permissible under State and local money.

Mr. GILMAN. I don't——

Mr. HAYS. The Governors, one of the amendments to the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 will allow the Governor to use the Governor's funds for teacher training.

Mr. GILMAN. Is that Federal money?

Mr. HAYS. That's Federal money.

In addition, the 10 percent that the State education agencies may take of the State money going for education, a lot of that, much of that is used for education and teacher training purposes.

In addition, one of the major expenditures at the local education level is to provide for teacher training of their staffs.

Mr. GILMAN. Has the regional teacher training centers been effective, if being properly implemented, has there been any oversight and evaluation?

Mr. HAYS. Our regional centers, we feel, have been properly implemented. The evaluation that we have, and, basically, in talking to our clientele, which are State education agencies and other State educational leaders, is very positive.

Secretary CAVAZOS. I might add, coming back, Mr. Gilman, to the issue on the $7 million available for teacher training, we extended the application time of that to June 13, to allow other applicants to come in. We had a total of 226 applications, and we will be able to fund about 57 of those that we felt were eligible and met the kinds of criteria that we were asking for.

So, you can see by that number the tremendous interest that's out there in terms of teacher training.

Mr. GILMAN. I recognize the interest, I just was concerned about the funding.

One last question. I know I've exceeded my time, Mr. Chairman.

Are you getting proper input from the State departments of education in the strategy that you are recommending to Mr. Bennett? Have they been consulted? Are they making input with regard to your recommendations to Mr. Bennett?

Secretary CAVAZOS. What is happening is that our staff is meeting weekly with Mr. Bennett's staff.

Do you want to talk a little bit about the other State involvement?

Mr. HAYS. Right.

We have an ongoing discussion with our State education agencies and other leaders, both formally and informally, and their input is provided to us on a regular basis on a range of issues.

And, yes, I think we are fairly well aware of the issues that they face, and we have shared that with the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

Mr. GILMAN. Have you explicitly asked them to make recommendations with regard to a national strategy?

Mr. HAYS. No, we didn't explicitly ask that, because I think we had a pretty good idea of what the States were concerned with and their issues.

Mr. GILMAN. Well, don't you think it might be worthwhile to make that request?

Mr. HAYS. What we did do, Mr. Gilman, is to provide a list of names to Director Bennett of directors at the State level and others that he might want to personally talk to, and I think a number of those people have been brought into the process.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RANGEL. Mr. Herger is recognized.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Secretary, I join in welcoming you here to our committee.

In March 1989, your Department announced new regulations that would be in place that affected, roughly, 3 million Pell Grant recipients, along with approximately 12,000 other grant recipients. The substance of the regulation seemed to be that these grant recipients needed to "declare themselves drug free." Beyond this declaration, are there any other requirements to ensure that none of the grant recipients are involved in any way with the drug use, and maybe if you could discuss that a little bit, please?

Secretary CAVAZOS. All right, sir.

Certainly, one of the most vital areas where we can work is in higher education, and as you so accurately point out, we have a responsibility there, certainly the assurance of Pell Grant recipients

that they are drug free. We are gathering those assurances and we will have close to over 3.5 million Pell Grant recipients. So, each of them will be certifying as to their condition on that.

The other part that we're doing, which I think is vital, is trying to get the universities to become involved in these programs on reducing alcohol and drug use. So, it's more than just a certification. We really feel that it's an educational component that they've got to provide as well.

And so, for the last 2 years we have been working as a Department with colleges and universities, including their deans, the offices of student affairs, the faculty, and all of these different groups to make our expectations very, very clear and our intention to enforce the Anti-Drug and Alcohol Program.

Now, to date, about 1,200 institutions, that's about a third of the universities and colleges in the United States, have joined this network, and we're working to get the rest of them on board.

Now, I must say that in the 9 months that I've been Secretary, that number has gone up from about 600 to 1,200, where we are today, so that gives you a little bit of the progress that we're having out there, the impact on the universities.

It's my hope that before this committee in subsequent months that we'll be able to report that all of them will have joined our drug-free network.

So, yes, that is an important part, and we'll continue to do that. We are having training workshops with the universities, 20 State and regional networks have been established throughout the country to provide a forum for sharing ideas, and what works, what doesn't work, and we are actually going to have a conference here, a national conference that will be here in the spring of 1990, where we will invite these universities to come share their ideas and problems in terms of a drug-free campus.

Mr. HERGER. That sounds very good. I'm pleased at the progress that we're making.

Again, if I can just ask that question again, is there anything more than just a statement on their part, is there any way of—any other verification of whether or not a student is drug-free or not? Is it pretty much the word of the student, and only his word?

Secretary CAVAZOS. Well, one of the things that we have down the road, basically, what we're getting to is, how do you really monitor the effectiveness of someone checking off yes or no whether they are drug-free or not.

We do not have the mechanism in place at the present time to check 3.5 million of those. You know, we are going to have to rely on the universities to point out to us when they have a problem with a student becoming involved in a drug issue.

Therefore, what we need to do is, we are going to have to create some mechanism for sharing information between the colleges, the States and the Federal Government, and not just the Department of Education. We're going to have to find some way to monitor that. I think that you have touched on one of the most important issues for us. We do not want to award grants unless students certify that they are drug-free. Yet, right now we don't really have an effective way of monitoring that, and that is one of the areas where we've been working very, very hard.

OMB is helping us to develop these kinds of programs, and our staff will just try to do the best it can on enforcement, but that's going to take a while. Of course, this applies to research grants to the university, as well as the Pell Grants, any Federal programs. So, the monitoring system is massive. That's not an excuse, it's just going to take some time to put that in place.

Mr. HERGER. But, we are working on that?

Secretary CAVAZOS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HERGER. We are working toward developing that. Very good.

As I know also you are aware, user accountability provisions of the new drug law passed just this last October sought to put an end to so-called "casual user" and "yuppie" drug abuse. Have there been any instances of sanctions being levied against universities, their officials or student recipients of this Federal grant money, for not complying?

Mr. HAYS. Well, there was a higher education report approximately 2 years ago which looked at the policies and the enforcement and how many sanctions had been applied, and the number of sanctions for drug abuse were not high. I don't have the specific number, but I can certainly provide it.

Mr. HERGER. Would you say that they are not high because of success in the program, or they are not high because, perhaps, we are not monitoring as well as we could be?

Mr. HAYS. I don't know all of the reasons. However, the program that the Secretary talked about our network, the core to that network is development of standards, and part of those standards deal with the types of policies that institutions should have, and the enforcement of those policies in a reasonable, and effective and straightforward way.

Secretary CAVAZOS. I might extend that response a little bit and point out, as a former university president, the seriousness with which those things impact our campus. Hardly a week would go by that I did not discuss with my vice president for student affairs an incident involving drugs on campus, and I think that the awareness level amongst the universities now is very, very high.

Obviously, with the change in the legal age for alcohol use, that presents us with another set of issues that presidents must deal with, but I can reassure this committee, and I have worked very closely with large numbers of the university presidents, that this is a vital issue and they are going to stay in touch. They are going to network, they are going to talk about what works, what doesn't work, and the most effective way as far as I am concerned as an administrator, is having an effective program in place on the campus with a vice president or dean who is going to follow up on those issues. In addition, these programs have to include the students themselves, through such groups as the student council, student government, and the student senate, that are very much attuned to these issues.

What we have to do, therefore, is to include drug education as part of the total education, and that's what we're doing.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Secretary, thank you very much.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Thank you, sir.

Chairman RANGEL. Mr. Ortiz.

Mr. ORTIZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to take this opportunity to welcome our Secretary and fellow Texans from my neck of the woods.

One of the questions that I would like for you, Mr. Secretary, to elaborate would be on the curriculum that you talked about. Before we go into that, are you aware of any State that has set up any type of curriculum at this point?

Secretary CAVAZOS. I'm not aware of any that has a formal curriculum in place, Mr. Ortiz. Perhaps, you might know of some, Mr. Hays.

I'll come back to the rest of your question.

Mr. ORTIZ. Sure.

Mr. HAYS. Well, approximately 39 States require substance abuse programs for the local school districts. Thirty-two States provide guidance, various types of guidance on curricula. Some States, such as the State of Texas, is working on a statewide model, and I think that model is being developed by Texas A&M.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Mr. Ortiz, if I may, let me explain a little bit more about this, and I'm sure that the Select Committee must really know how important this is to all of us. I believe that we must start the education of the problem with drugs in kindergarten, very frankly.

When I came to the Department I directed the drug oversight staff I want to develop a model curriculum. Even though we can't impose that model curriculum, I want to be able to say to Texas, or Virginia, or any of the other States, "Here it is; you may want to try it in conjunction with what you are already doing."

As a result, a grade-by-grade curriculum is being prepared. It will be a curriculum that could become a part of the core curriculum, not just a casual kind of a thing that we're going to do here and there. Finally, we feel that if we can make an impact in the schools that we'll make a lot of progress in reducing the over-all drug problem.

As you recognize, there have been other efforts, you know, for example, the cigarette issue. That one started turning around in the schools through education right away. Young people began to change their attitudes and express concerns about their parents' problems with smoking. Hopefully, we'll just create a tradition.

Now, in concert with that, Mr. Ortiz, it is not sufficient, though, to say we are going to educate them. We've got to keep them in school. In our own State of Texas, there's a tremendous dropout rate, and those are the people who we're not reaching. Well, we have to find a way to stem that.

So, I'm not saying that a curriculum is going to solve the problem, because there are a lot of other problems that are tied to that. But I think we can effect change. I wouldn't be in education if I didn't think it was possible but and it's not going to happen over night.

Mr. ORTIZ. You know, when you mentioned dropout rates, and, of course, this is affecting very seriously Hispanics and other minorities, and many of the reasons is that in some areas we do have high unemployment, we go into my neck of the woods and unemployment is as high in some areas as 40, 45, and 50 percent.

Is there any way that you can relate or interject with other agencies, such as the Secretary of Housing, and I'm pretty sure you are

doing this, and HHS, to see how, not only the child can be helped, but to reach the family also?

Secretary CAVAZOS. I think you've touched on the key, reaching the family, because I really think that the prevention problems of this kind will be affected by strong parental involvement early on.

With this in mind we are working with Health and Human Services with the Head Start Program and some of the other areas that they are doing. We have some educational programs as well—Even Start, which is within our Department. We are also working with the Department of Labor, obviously, where there's a concern about education and drugs in the workplace, so that we have a tremendous involvement across the board.

But, coming back to your point about the tie between dropouts and the issue of education, as you know, in the State of Texas, we have about a 45-percent dropout rate among Hispanics. It's about 35 percent for the blacks, and about 30 percent for the Anglos. The dropout rate is a statewide problem affecting all ethnic groups, and I still am convinced that we've got to stem that. I'm sure that drugs are a factor which contributes to these high rates. Drug use also accounts for a portion of the unemployment and for the social ills that we have throughout.

What I've tried to do, Mr. Ortiz, is to make dropout reduction the centerpiece of what we are doing in the Department by working with those people who are at risk of dropping out, those people who have dropped out, with the illiterates, with the people who really don't have the advantages, the handicapped and others, who maybe do not have access to education, and making sure that every person has that.

What I'm talking about is not going to happen, unfortunately, during my time. It's not going to happen until somewhere around the turn of the century. People come to me and say, "you've been Secretary of Education for 9 months and what have you done about the educational programs? We're still having problems in this nation with education." They are so wrong to expect overnite results, because it is a program that we must start to work on and be vigorous about for the next decade.

I cannot give you any more hope than that, Mr. Ortiz.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Secretary, you come here to this committee hearing to and to your position as Secretary of Education with outstanding credentials and an outstanding track record.

I'm a fairly new member, I've been here 7 years, but I agree that education is the answer. We've had hearings, Mr. Chairman, where we have had State warden prisons, and superintendent of prisons, and they come and they tell us that education is the key. But then, we go back, you know, to what Chairman Rangel has been saying, coming from a law enforcement background, we need some type of strategy, some type of a blueprint, and I hope that with this blueprint we can go back and we can unite the local efforts and State efforts to fight.

My time is up. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RANGEL. You are the only one that really respects this 5-minute rule.

Mr. Paxon.

Mr. PAXON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would just like to follow up if I could, Mr. Secretary, on my colleague and friend, Congressman Herger's, comments.

You talk about the increase in the number of schools, universities, joining with us in the drug-free university concept. I just would like to ask you, you seem to be talking about the burden being on us to come up with an idea or an enforcement mechanism to determine the level of accountability.

Mr. Secretary, why can't we turn that around and require the universities to do that? We shouldn't be doing that here. Let's let them be creative, and tell us how they are going to prove to us that they have reached a certain level of compliance, that they have reacted to the proposals we've laid out, but they show it to us in very specific criteria, and I don't care if one school uses one method, one another, but the goal is what we are interested in, and let's let them tell us how they are going to accomplish this goal, and, quite candidly, follow it up with very, very strong measures at this end.

I don't think that the taxpayers in my district could care to give 1 cent in aid or assistance to a university or college that will not, do the very minimum, assist us in this effort, and I would just be interested in your view of turning it over and putting the onus on those institutions to come up with the plan, the enforcement, the mechanism to reduce drug use at their facilities.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Well, certainly, I agree with you, Mr. Paxon. This is a shared responsibility, and as far as I'm concerned, we have to take that first step of demonstrating leadership, training those colleges and universities as to what works, encouraging the development of campus-wide plans, and involving them in all the drug abuse efforts.

After that, what we have to do, though, is follow up. In other words, once we give them training, we need to go back in 6 months and find out how they are doing, or if we have continuing violations.

So my point is that we have the expectation that the universities will be held accountable. If universities and colleges want Federal dollars, they are going to have to find ways of demonstrating that they have a drug-free campus.

I will start at the top with the presidents. Having been one for 8½ years, which is about twice as long as anyone ought to be a university president, I know if you don't have leadership, change is not going to take place.

So that's our strategy—I agree with you—we need to hold them responsible.

Mr. PAXON. Well, Mr. Secretary, there certainly has been leadership at the top from your Department and from this administration in that regard, and I just hope that when we start this school year this fall that the message is loud, it's clear, it is unequivocal, you will not receive Federal assistance of any type, and your students will not receive Federal assistance, unless you institute that drug-free setting.

Let me just say, Mr. Secretary, as I guess I'm getting older, but I don't feel I've been out of school that long, I know this, that if students know that they are in jeopardy of losing their assistance for that school or for individual students, there will be intense pressure on the university, and on that college, to get their act togeth-

er, to get this program in place, and we won't have to worry about Washington coming up with new rules and regulations, those students will demand it. And, at the universities that don't, there will be the freedom of choice for students to go to the universities that provide those kind of programs, because they are now eligible for Federal aid that other schools and universities aren't, and I'd like to see it start right with my State university system, and intend to take that right back to my State legislators.

One other quick question. Decline in high school seniors using drugs was reported by your Department. Could you just give us the why's for why that's working, what's working and what isn't, in terms of getting seniors, and I assume other students.

Secretary CAVAZOS. All right. I'm going to ask Mr. Hays to follow up after I make an early comment in here. I think what is starting to work is one of the points that you talked about, peer pressure. I think that young people now are becoming more and more aware of the problems that we have there. I think there is starting just a flicker of awareness of the problem and what's happening there.

We have seen some decreases in drug use. I'd like to think that it's education that has started to turn those around, because we know that the drugs are still out there and they are available in large quantities. Therefore, if you see a decrease, it must be for a reason, other than the fact that it's not available. It really must be through education.

Dick, do you want to talk a little bit about the specifics.

Mr. HAYS. Right. I think the Secretary was right on the mark. I think a lot of things are working out there, thank goodness, and what is very heartening is that the last 2 years have shown that we're making some progress in certain areas. The certain areas are, certainly, with hard drugs.

A key finding in this research is that more and more of our Nation's youth are concerned, see the dangers of drug abuse, and, really, the last report indicates, want little to do with those who use drugs. I think that's an extraordinarily important finding.

Some things that we need to be aware of in looking at that data is that the drug of choice among our Nation's youth is alcohol, and that that is not decreasing at any rapid rate. The other concern is that this is a measure of those who finish high school. These are high school seniors, while we don't have as good information about those who don't make it that far, and we're working with HHS to see what we can do about getting better information on those children, because that, we feel, may be an area where there isn't good news.

Secretary CAVAZOS. I'd like for just a moment for the record here, to touch on that issue of alcohol, because it certainly is an illegal drug for those under 21. I testified before Senator Glenn's committee a few weeks ago on this issue.

We have to work together, all of us, to try to raise that awareness again about the problems with alcohol. When we tend to think about drugs, and we see those numbers coming down, we feel good about it. But then you stop to think about the two issues, the dropouts and the fact that we still have alcohol abuse problems, which are just as serious.

Mr. PAXON. Very serious when you report that 60 percent of high school seniors are using alcohol as their drug of choice, but, yet, 44 percent, according to the information you've provided, indicate that they don't consider alcohol as a drug. We certainly need to do much more along those lines, and I think that's probably true of the general population also.

Thank you very much. My time is expired.

Chairman RANGEL. Mr. Oxley.

Mr. OXLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, there have been some reports recently that schools are having problems getting rid of students, expelling or having any kind of a disciplinary action against drug abusing students, because the students have fallen under the definition of handicapped under the 1973 Rehabilitation Act.

We had some discussions with Secretary Kemp when he was here a few weeks ago in regard to getting rid of drug abusing people in HUD projects.

Are you aware of some of these problems, and are you aware of Senator Coats' legislation which would change the definition of who is, indeed, handicapped?

The problem being, of course, that the schools are a bit leery of expelling students, because they are concerned about a civil rights violation, a potential violation, and being dragged into court, and would you, indeed, be willing to support legislation such as Senator Coats, that we could get some common sense, perhaps, back in the existing statutes?

Secretary CAVAZOS. Let me start out by talking about discipline. Basically, that's what we are talking about here. You cannot have learning unless you have discipline, discipline of mind, of body, unless you have a place that is disciplined to learn in.

So, therefore, I think it is vital that we give principals and teachers of those schools all of the support that we can give them so they can deal with the kinds of issues that you are talking about.

I certainly will support it. I really have found, any time that I go to a good school, and I go to a lot of really fine schools out there, I always take time first to talk to the principals, just for a few minutes, quietly, by ourselves. When we talk I ask them to tell me about their school, about the drug issues, about the level of support. When I find a good school it's because, generally, I find a principal who understands the issues and will work on them and help to solve the problems.

Second, I talk to some of the teachers, and, third, I always ask to talk to the parents and the students.

What I am saying is that you create an environment, and if that environment is not good, and you do have people using drugs who cannot be removed from that campus for legal reasons of definition, then we need to change that system. We need to give those principals and teachers, and parents and students, the support they must have to have the kind of learning area they need.

So, yes, I would support it, sir.

Mr. OXLEY. I appreciate that.

I will introduce a companion bill in the House that would do the same type of thing, and I don't think that the original congression-

al intent, specifically, was to include those people that are drug abusers or alcohol abusers under the term "handicapped."

Secretary CAVAZOS. Yes, sir.

Mr. OXLEY. I think that's almost a self-induced handicap, and I just don't think that that was the original congressional intent. I appreciate your support on that.

Let me ask you, I was looking at this drug prevention curricula, and I was looking, obviously, at my home State and where they stood in the four areas that you have enunciated, "State requires substance abuse education," I'm pleased to see Ohio said yes and does have that program. Also, "Certification requirement in substance abuse education for all teachers," Ohio participates. But, they do not in the two areas that you had mentioned in your opening remarks, "Minimum curriculum standards provided," Ohio, at least as of October 1987, does not participate, nor has the State of Ohio adopted or designed a prevention curriculum. Again, I could be wrong, because it's about 1½ years later.

By the way, New York State, and we have some New Yorker's here, is a yes across the board on that. California is one no, so they are doing a little better than Ohio.

What can we do, and what can you do, to bring the States into compliance? For example, we've got 39 States that require substance abuse education, so we've made great progress, 32 States minimum curriculum standards provided, but only 11 that require certifications in substance abuse education for all teachers, and only 17 have adopted or designed prevention curricula.

What can we do to highlight that, maybe put a little bit of pressure on the State Department of Education in Ohio and other States that aren't participating, to make this a more effective program?

Secretary CAVAZOS. I think, certainly, that those four areas, substance abuse, certification of teachers, the minimum curriculum standards, and the prevention curriculum, are vital and key to the kinds of issues that have been raised here in this discussion today.

Therefore, I really believe that there are a variety of strategies we can put in place to make sure that every State does that, and I would start, very frankly, back home. I mean, people often times think we are going to start in Washington. Well I'm going to start back home, and I am going to call upon parents throughout this Nation to ask that very basic question you asked, sir, Why aren't we having those minimum kinds of requirements?"

I asked school boards in recent weeks, and I asked parents to really ask questions of the schools, "What are you doing in terms of your educational program?" This is as vital to the educational program as, "What are you doing in mathematics and English?" as far as I am concerned.

So, I am going to call upon the parents to start that, and I would call upon the State legislators, and the State leaders, and we really need to ask our chief State school officers that vital question.

Mr. OXLEY. How do you plan to do that, specifically?

Secretary CAVAZOS. You can just write to them and say, "You know you need to do this, why aren't you doing it?" We expect that, and I really believe that we can communicate that to them in a forceful way.

Do you see another mechanism?

Mr. HAYS. Well, I think that's an excellent one. In addition, we have our conference with State leaders in various forums.

Mr. OXLEY. You have one planned, you mean?

Mr. HAYS. Pardon?

Mr. OXLEY. Is that a regular kind of a conference?

Mr. HAYS. Yes. We have an annual meeting with the leaders and with the Governor's office, from the Governor's office and from the State education agency, and at that time we try and share what we think ought to be done and where they ought to be going, and the Secretary was our lead speaker last time and provided quite a bit of direction this past year. And, we will continue that.

I think, as you indicated, the report is 2-years old. I think there is more progress, and we'll be updating that information shortly.

Chairman RANGEL. Would you yield on that point?

Mr. OXLEY. Certainly, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RANGEL. Are you saying that you have a nationwide conference that you include the Governors of the 50 States and the concessions?

Mr. HAYS. Representatives of the Governors. As you know, the Governor receives 30 percent of our money at the State and local level, and we have their representatives, as well as the chief State school officer's representative.

Chairman RANGEL. It would have so much of a psychological impact on the Nation if you could see your way clear to call in all of the State commissioners of education, and at least lay out a blueprint for them as to where you would want to see them going with this national education strategy, because, quite frankly, to be honest with you, I can't find that strategy in education or anyplace else.

I know that the Secretary, more than probably anyone else in this Nation, certainly in the Congress, knows what is necessary, but we don't know.

It would seem to me that maybe we're just too dumb and backwards to understand as legislators, but you might feel more comfortable to bring in the State commissioners of education and say, "Listen, this is my business, and I'm talking to you as peers, because it is your business. You get your State legislators to work, we are going to put the heat to the Congress, but we're coming up with a plan because we are at war."

Think about it, because, again, we don't want to tell you how to run your shop, but we need a lot of direction.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Mr. Chairman, I have an 11 o'clock meeting.

Chairman RANGEL. I know.

Secretary CAVAZOS. So, I'm kind of getting a little bit on my time here, but this is vital and important to me, so I want you to recognize that I'm trying, you know, it's very—it is an important meeting, and so, therefore, I find myself that I'm going to have to be, I'll excuse myself and say I'll come back some other time.

Chairman RANGEL. I was misinformed. I thought you had until 11 o'clock. I certainly would have been tighter with the time. I have Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Hughes and Mr. Towns here, and they told me that you had to leave here at 11.

I wonder whether you can give just 2 minutes——

Secretary CAVAZOS. Oh, yes, sir, I certainly will.

Chairman RANGEL. Well, let me——

Secretary CAVAZOS. Let's proceed.

Chairman RANGEL. Right.

Mr. Hughes, Mr. Towns and Mr. Scheuer.

Mr. HUGHES. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and welcome, Mr. Secretary and Director Hays. I'd like to pick up on the question of what is the Federal leadership role? One of the things we require in the 1988 Anti-Drug Abuse Act is that your Department work with Health and Human Services in developing an independent evaluation of programs around the country that will work, and then reporting back to the Congress some time in 1991. How is that coming along, that particular——

Secretary CAVAZOS. Do you want to talk just a little bit, because it is moving ahead.

Mr. HUGHES. Can you brief me on that, Mr. Director?

Mr. HAYS. Yes.

The evaluation on effective practices and programs that we're to do with HHS is on track. We're right now doing the finishing work on getting the request for proposal out for bids. That interim report is due to Congress in 1991, we'll meet that date.

Mr. HUGHES. I think that is one of the important areas of leadership. I think that the States are looking for national leadership, you know, what is working, what's not working. We've done that on the enforcement side. A number of years ago, I and others wrote the Justice Assistance Act. It takes a lot of programs on the enforcement side, and it says to the police, this has worked in parts of the country, career criminal and promise, and neighborhood street watch, and a whole host of other fundable categories, and we say, look, try this, it's worked in California and New Jersey, you ought to take a look at this. And, if you will, we'll provide a little seed money for you.

Do you envision that as part of your leadership role?

Secretary CAVAZOS. That's a very, very important part of what we're doing right now. We have some programs out there demonstrating what works, and we're evaluating those things.

You know, for example, we recently had 47 schools that came in from throughout the Nation that had been recognized as being drug-free. They had a very difficult set of criteria that we put onto that, and I'm talking about high school and grade schools as well. They came to Washington, and we recognized them. But on top of that, we took their plans and their ideas, did an abstract on them, sent them throughout the Nation, and these are the kinds of strategies that these schools have put in place to turn it around. This is an annual program. We'll do it every year, and this year we had 47.

Mr. HUGHES. Well, that's excellent, and I would encourage you to continue that. That seems to me to be what we should be doing.

The Office of Substance Abuse Prevention, which is part of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration of the Health and Human Services Department, is basically doing a lot of work in the area of workers in the prevention area, developing curriculum for workers. Are you doing anything comparable in Education?

Secretary CAVAZOS. Well, we are doing the comparable thing from the educational side, and I will personally mail out a copy of our curriculum to every member of this committee by January 1990, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HUGHES. That's good, that's important.

How about for our prisons?

Secretary CAVAZOS. I'm sorry?

Mr. HUGHES. Our prisons, part of our problem in the prisons is that we are warehousing prisoners who have a myriad of problems. They are illiterate, they have no skills, they have drug problems. What are we doing to develop curriculum in our prisons? Are you working with the Director of the Bureau of Prisons at all in developing curriculum in our prisons?

Secretary CAVAZOS. Do you want to touch on that?

Mr. HAYS. The basic priority of the Office of Substance Abuse, as you mentioned, Mr. Hughes, is the high-risk area, and they are focusing on that.

In addition, the Governors' money that we provide, at least 50 percent of the Governors money is for high-risk youth, and those are youths who have had problems in various areas, and those are the priority for those projects provided by the Governor.

Mr. HUGHES. I think that is what the chairman is referring to, we'd all like to see just exactly what should be our strategy. We've talked about a number of different strategies, but I think we are all interested in knowing just exactly what our Federal leadership role is to be and how can we be most effective. What is that strategy? What are our priorities? How much monies are we going to be putting into childhood development activities?

Where you, Mr. Secretary, indicate we should be doing much more, really, K-8, when they get to high school, it's very difficult to turn them around.

Secretary CAVAZOS. All the way through high school.

Mr. HUGHES. But, that's where the battle has to be waged a lot more intensely.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Well, I think, Mr. Hughes, in my opening statement I pointed out the importance of that early childhood education, but then running it all the way through high school, and reaching out to those people who are in trouble, and educating them. Certainly, the incarcerated need our attention an awful lot there in terms of educational programs. If they come out illiterate, if they can't cope with the world, they'll be right back into drugs, in crime, before the Sun sets.

Therefore, we are going to have to work with the States to provide those kinds of programs, and the dollars. We don't have those dollars, but we certainly have the leadership to try to do it.

Mr. HUGHES. Well, we could be of valuable assistance to you. You'll be the first Secretary that's done it if you do it, and I have a feeling you will. I hope you will share with us what the strategy is.

Chairman RANGEL. Mr. Towns.

Mr. TOWNS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, people in the area of treatment and ex-addicts are complaining about the fact that they have no input when it comes to education. Former addicts say they have a lot of information that they would like to share, but nobody is talking to them.

Are recovering and former addicts included in your Technical Assistance Team?

Secretary CAVAZOS. Do you want to address that?

Mr. HAYS. I think we are aware of the problems and issues in the area, and in our technical assistance through the Regional Centers they know the problems associated with those who have had abuse problems.

I don't think we have concentrated on that in a major way, but, yes, we have information and we are aware of the situation.

Mr. TOWNS. It would seem to me that that would be very valuable information. They are people who are involved on an ongoing basis dealing with the problem, and folks who have gone through the problem, it would seem to me that in order to have the kind of team that would be able to effectively combat the substance abuse problem, you would have to include them.

Mr. HAYS. We certainly need their perspective, as well as the perspective of those who have never used or abused.

Mr. TOWNS. Right. I come from an area where 50 percent of our young people are dropping out of school, according to the New York City Board of Education's figures. I would think the 50 percent figure is probably very conservative considering that we are losing a great number of young people and their future potential to drug use and drug trafficking.

I would just like to make the point that has been made, if drugs are truly a national problem, why can't your Department issue a blueprint for these Federal funds? It seems the Education Department wants strict accountability on one hand, but, on the other hand, wants States to take the initiative to find solutions. I'm afraid you cannot have it both ways. Either the Federal Government will provide strong oversight and an effective plan or 50 different States will use 50 different approaches. Let's face it, solution will not be found unless there is a common plan capable of alterations which will accommodate individual differences. The Federal Government must provide the blueprint for the local schools. Principals and administrators of high schools are not likely to admit a problem exists. They feel that if I say that there's a drug problem in my school it's a direct reflection on my ability to provide leadership for this institution, so they are not going to be candid about it.

So, I think that you need to take that fact into consideration, and the only way that you can solve that is let it come down from the top to them, and then I think the response will be different.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TOWNS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RANGEL. Our last, but our specialist in education and other vital issues affecting the free world, is Mr. Scheuer.

Mr. SCHEUER. I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I'm afraid that part of the problem is that there are no specialists in drug education. At least if there are, if they are out there, we haven't heard from them.

I participated in a hearing of the Health and Environment Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee on the problem of AIDS, AIDS education, and, of course, when you talk about AIDS, you have to talk about drugs because most AIDS now comes from intravenous drug use.

24-274 0 - 90 - 2

One of the witnesses was Roy Innes, who I'm sure you know, Eddie, Chairman of the Congress on Racial Equality, and an old hand at minority concerns. He's been around the track a long time. He told us that we don't have the—not the most basic clue of how to design education programs that meet the real needs, the hands-on needs of these kids from deprived homes and minority neighborhoods on drug education or AIDS education. He says we don't have a clue, and that we ought to start from word one on basic research on what works and doesn't work.

Now, Mr. Secretary, I heard you say that there are things that are working out there. Could you give us a report of a few pages, whatever, identifying which of the drug education programs, State programs, Federal programs, city programs, are working? What kind of things seem to work, and what kind of things seem to be a total waste of time, and expend money without producing real learning, real understanding, on the part of the kids?

Now, this is a tough problem, and as I understand it from Roy Innes and others, very little, if any, of what we have tried in the past in terms of drug education seems to have worked, seems to have turned kids around. Half of the kids, perhaps, who go through the schools don't get involved in drug abuse. What is it that makes them impervious? What is it that society has done for them, that their parents have done for them, that the schools, the churches, the Boy's Clubs, the Police Athletic League have done with them and for them, that make them impervious to drugs?

If you could give us a thoughtful summary in the next week or two, I would ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that we hold the record open to receive the Secretary's thoughts on, up to now, what kind of education works, and, also, the Department's plans for implementing some thoughtful research programs into further sharpening our understanding of what works.

Chairman RANGEL. Without objection, and if they can ever find out where Roy Innes is, I wish they would share it with the Chair. I haven't heard from this man in a decade.

Mr. SCHEUER. He showed up in Washington the week before last.

Chairman RANGEL. I'm glad to hear that.

Mr. SCHEUER. I tell you, he was a mighty impressive witness, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RANGEL. Well, I'm glad that you found out where he was.

Mr. SCHEUER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have one more question, okay.

About Head Start, I can't think of any better antidote for drugs than helping kids achieve education success in the schools.

Secretary CAVAZOS. I agree.

Mr. SCHEUER. I can't think of a point that's a more important point than to intervene, to assure that kids make it in school, than to make them learning ready when they get to the school house doors. Unfortunately, a lot of these kids come from homes where they never hear a coherent sentence, they don't hear cerebral thought, they don't see newspapers, magazines, books at home. When they come to the school, they don't know their colors, they don't know the days of the week, they don't know how to tell time, they don't know the difference between silk and wool. They have

an enormous education gap to bridge before they can compete as kids from middle-class homes.

We talk about the dropout program. Yes, kids drop out in the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth grades, when they physically leave school, but if in first and second grades they don't learn how to read, they don't learn how to write, they don't learn how to count, they are out of it. They can't compete with their middle-class peers. They can't compete with other kids, and mentally, psychologically, they have dropped out.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHEUER. Once they drop out, they are prey to drugs, and I think the fact that you're researching the drug habits of high school seniors tells a small part of the story, but not much of the story, because the great part of the story is the kids who failed, who got involved in drugs, and who dropped out and never made it to senior. So, you are looking at one small piece of the pie, and you are not looking at the rest of the pie, of the kids who dropped out, the kids on the street dropped out of school, they are the source of the drug habit, they are the source of drug dealing in the school yards, they are the source of a lot of the urban crime that is wrecking, destroying the quality of life in our urban communities today.

I'd like to ask you, are you doing anything, perhaps, with the Secretary of HHS, where I understand the Head Start jurisdiction is, are you doing anything to assure full funding for Head Start, so that six sixths, all of the kids who urgently need Head Start, who are at dire education risk, get the advantages of an enriched preschool program, not one sixth, as we are presently doing?

Secretary CAVAZOS. Well, certainly, we are working very, very hard with Health and Human Services in trying to extend this program. We have the educational involvement. You know, as far as I am concerned, if there's a person to be educated, they are our responsibility in this Nation.

We feel, currently, that our request for the budget for the coming year, at least certainly within the Department of Education, is about the best that we can do at the present time.

Mr. SCHEUER. Let me just add there a footnote. I heard the President's wife, Barbara Bush, a very fine, highly intelligent woman, laud Head Start, and extol its benefits. Have you been in touch with her as a possible sort of support for full funding for Head Start?

Secretary CAVAZOS. Not directly, sir.

Mr. SCHEUER. Well, I suggest that you do it. She's a terrific lady. I've known her for years. She's an exemplary women who, apparently, is deeply concerned in preschool, early childhood education, and I think you have a great ally there if you would seize the medal and approach her.

Secretary CAVAZOS. I'd like, if I may, Congressman, just to respond briefly. I know I'm coming to a close in terms of my time, but you touched upon another vital issue. You and I were talking earlier about childhood education, and I want to reassure you with respect to our approach. We're thinking about, we're thinking about the totality of education, not just the high schoolers. We are talking about beginning our efforts at an early age.

There are a couple of programs that I think we need to recognize that, perhaps, could be of assistance. We talk a lot about day care in this Nation. We talk a lot about people participating and looking after these children—that's terribly important. I support that.

But, in the Department, we are moving more and more toward another concept, one that will take advantage of that day care situation, but move into an area that actually is a phrase that my wife coined, she said, "Well, why don't you call it 'learning care,' make every moment for a child a learning moment," and you so eloquently clarified it when you pointed out, that's where you learn your colors, your numbers, not to take the first grade curriculum and move it back to a 3-year-old, but teach them those things, because if children are not prepared to learn when they come to school, they start falling behind and falling behind.

You are so accurate. By the third grade to the fourth grade, you can predict who is in trouble and is going to drop out. I assure you that I recognize that that's a vital area, and it's not just the drug issue, it's the totality of education, the intellectual side, and we will work in that area.

Mr. Chairman, we really appreciate your support.

Chairman RANGEL. Listen, Mr. Secretary, you've been very kind and generous, and I thank Mr. Hays for his willingness to stay here. We are going to work very, very closely with Mr. Hays, and see whether or not we can share our view.

Please, don't hesitate when you differ or you have a different road for us to march. Thank you so much.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We'll provide the information that you've requested.

Chairman RANGEL. All right.

Mr. Hays, what I've just told the Secretary, I do hope that you can get together with staff. We want you to know, we don't want you marching to 50 committees. When we start talking with you, we're going to bring in the chairmen of the committees. We believe that our Secretary of Education should be that Czar, should be that national leader, but we're not going to ask him to step on jurisdiction of the Attorney General or Health and Human Services. We are going to bring in Gus Hawkins, Congressman Scheuer, and other educational experts, to make certain that when the Secretary goes out there, that you will already have legislative support.

When Congressman Towns talks about the inner cities, you may not have jurisdiction to do some of the things that we would like to see. But, if we can show you where the fatalities are, if we show you where the dropouts are, we show you where the addicts are, where the rehabilitation centers are, it seems to me that the Secretary should be targeting those areas for some type of treatment to avoid these people who are at risk, and we should be able to target those educational programs.

They may be political and legislative problems, but that's where you and I, and the committee—leadership of the standing committees—will work on those things.

Of course, we need help with our local and State educators. Mr. Towns pointed out that no one likes to wash their dirty linen publicly and tell you that half their kids who are on drugs come from broken homes, or have no fathers, or have AIDS, but still, when

professionals get together they can discuss these things. If the Secretary of Education, with all of his expertise and sensitivity, was to have an all-day, or 2 or 3 days conference with our State educators, asking them to bring their State specialists on drugs with them, it would really be a booster for the entire country to know that we have some type of blueprint.

I don't think that I'm beating a dead horse when I tell you that I don't see a blueprint. I see some pamphlets, a video, a curriculum being worked up—there's not a department that doesn't have a pamphlet, a video and some program being worked up. I would hate to see Mr. Bennett usurp the role of the Secretary of Education, because we all can give these fiery speeches, but when we go back to our own districts they want to know, what's the Federal Government doing.

We are in touch with the State people. They would have us believe that there's no leadership coming from the Federal Government in education.

Mr. HAYS. I'm surprised to hear that, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RANGEL. Why don't you stay then? We've got another panel coming on, and you haven't really shared with us where the leadership—you know, I can't just give this to my Secretary of Education and say, here it is, I can't do that.

Mr. HAYS. I think all those are in a context that the Secretary laid out in his full testimony. He laid out a strategy, a plan, we'd be delighted to discuss it with you further.

Chairman RANGEL. Okay. Well, that's in his testimony, and I'm always impressed when I hear him on cable, or hear him personally, or hear his testimony. Is that reduced in a way that I can take that home and say, "This is what the Secretary expects from you, State commissioner of education." Is that any place that I can take and say, "This is our national strategy." That's what I'm asking for.

If you take away my Secretary, I don't have anybody.

Mr. HAYS. I think this Department has had a plan for several years, has pursued it aggressively, and——

Chairman RANGEL. You mean the Bennett plan?

Mr. HAYS [continuing]. We'd be happy to articulate that more fully, if you desire.

Chairman RANGEL. Well, now, you've really bitten off a lot. You are telling me that you really believe that in the last eight years we've had that strategy, that we've been pursuing aggressively?

Mr. HAYS. I'm talking about since the passage of the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, which serves as a cornerstone to the Department's efforts.

Chairman RANGEL. Is that the zero tolerance policy that Secretary Bennett shared with us?

Mr. HAYS. I'm not familiar with exactly what he shared with you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RANGEL. Were you with the Reagan administration in Education?

Mr. HAYS. I've been with many administrations since 1956, Mr. Chairman. I'm a career employee.

Chairman RANGEL. Okay, then, what we hope to do is to have you share with us in more detail the plan that the Secretary has

outlined, in terms of what is in place, not what he would like to see, but something that we can use to take to the other committees to say, this is what he would like to see happen in Education.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I'd also like to say that we've worked very closely with you and your committee staff through the years, and we will continue to do so.

Chairman RANGEL. Mr. Coughlin, the Secretary had to leave, which he had already told us ahead of time, but Mr. Hays was kind enough to stay behind. As you heard, he's a career professional and he will be working with staff so that we can have a better idea as to what the Secretary's views are in terms of a national strategy.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RANGEL. Thank you, Mr. Hays.

Mr. HAYS. Thank you.

Chairman RANGEL. You can feel free to listen to the views of the next panel.

Mr. HAYS. I appreciate your invitation.

Chairman RANGEL. They have testimony, have they not, that you can get, and we'll call this panel. Laurey Stryker, Assistant Commissioner of Education, Florida Department of Education; William McCord, Director, South Carolina Commission of Alcohol and Drug Abuse, and member of the National Association of State, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors; and Edward Zubrow, Special Assistant to the Superintendent of the Philadelphia Public Schools, and he'll be testifying on behalf of the Council of Great City Schools.

Thank you, Mr. Stryker, all of you. If there's no objection from the committee, we'll have all of your statements entered into the record as they are, and if you want to highlight that testimony you can feel free to testify as you feel comfortable. We'll start with Ms. Laurey Stryker.

TESTIMONY OF LAUREY T. STRYKER, ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Ms. STRYKER. Thank you.

Thank you for the invitation to come and share Florida's views on the very serious issues of drug and alcohol abuse and how we can have national and State compatible programs that can deal with this very serious issue.

Florida has had a unique challenge in educating our citizens about the use and abuse of alcohol and other drugs. Our accessibility is demonstrated by a fact that in 1988, of the 109,000 pounds of cocaine that were seized in this United States, 89 percent of it was seized in Florida. So that, much of the cocaine that's coming into our Nation and causing problems is coming through Florida; accessibility is there.

Our crime rate has risen dramatically. Sixty-five percent of our crime rate, we believe, can be stated as part of a drug-related crime.

The estimate of cost to drugs in Florida is some $7 billion, which include law enforcement, health care and treatment. It's interesting that this session we passed a law in our legislature to outlaw pagers in schools, because they were being used as a way to communicate either to prevent law enforcement from doing their job,

or to use as a way of communicating on drug selling. These are just some indicators of why, in our State, this has been a particular issue, and where we have been looking. We have been very pleased with some of the activities on the Federal level to help us in this very serious fight.

Florida is paying a particularly high price for the drug epidemic in our country. We are the front door, and we believe in Florida that education is the key to those students that have one of the most significant opportunities to be exposed to drugs in the nation.

In 1986, Florida mandated drug education as a regular part of the K-12 curriculum. We did this in a different way than some other States. We established what we called the Prevention Center within the Department of Education. Florida administers the Federal Drug-Free Schools and Communities programs through this Prevention Center.

The important thing about this Prevention Center is that it offers a comprehensive health curriculum that teaches students not only about drugs specifically, but to respect themselves and their bodies. High self-esteem and knowledge about drugs and alcohol together, we have found, gives students the tools to say no to the offer, that they are most certainly going to face some time in their young lives.

The Commissioner advocates a no use policy, and that's the focus of our teaching in our schools.

The Federal Drug-Free Schools funds go directly to the school districts. We require a plan and evaluation components. The State leadership training and guidelines, with local implementation, is working for us. A particular role of the State is to help in teacher training, because what we found is that teachers do not know a lot about drugs. They are not aware of the pressures that students are facing, and the specific of drugs, even drug terms and how they might be bantered around in school without a teacher really understanding what the students were talking about. So that activity went on especially the first 2 years of the program through a series of summer institutes.

We also recognize the effectiveness and importance for community involvement. The Prevention Center requires all districts to promote the active coordination of community agencies, organization, law enforcement, churches, business and parent groups. In each district, the Comprehensive Health, Education, Drug-Free Schools Advisory Council includes representatives of all of these groups.

We also recognize the need for close coordination between the Prevention Center and the local school districts. We provide technical assistance, training, resource reviews, exemplary instructional materials, evaluation, accountability and statewide leadership.

We have identified a contact in every district, and we are funding 45 out of 65 of these positions with the State directed dollars.

Coordination with State level organization and agencies allows Florida to effectively implement the Federal act. Our State level advisory council includes representatives of the Florida Health and Rehabilitative Services, the Florida Medical Association, the PTA, the Florida School Board's Association, the Florida Association of School Administrators, and representatives from community colleges and universities.

During the past 2 years, the Florida Department of Education has managed the discretionary funds allocated to the Governor's office for community-based programs. These programs include 27 community-based projects, and nine statewide cooperative organizations. All funds have been expended in these programs. Next year, these programs will be managed by the Governor's office in our State.

To assist the States, we recommend a comprehensive national drug abuse prevention policy that has clearly stated long-term goals. We would like to see the national policy address intervention and treatment for middle and high school students, while expanding the role of a very successful intervention that we found, and that's peer counseling.

Additionally, the national policy should include special efforts in alcohol abuse, which we've already stated is one of the highest areas of student use of drugs. We recognize that family alcoholism is a serious problem affecting our children.

The national policy should also incorporate the critical needs of children who live in high-density areas of poverty.

The President's recommendation for increasing the Federal Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act budget from $354 million to $367 million is a step in the right direction. In Florida, our allocation has translated to $3.74 per student.

However, this investment does not reflect an adequate commitment to preventing our country's school children, particularly our high-risk students, from becoming substance users. In comparison, this budget is less than the amount used to build a single B-2 Bomber.

America would survive without one more B-2 Bomber, but we cannot survive if we lose the war on drugs. We must have additional resources if we are to win this war and save our country's youth.

The next area of investment, we would recommend, from the basic drug education and awareness programs that have been funded, is in the area of intervention. The Florida Drug Survey showed that a lot of kids today need intervention. They are already users, or they come from families where drug and alcohol abuse are common.

More intensive services are needed, but we believe the decrease in the need for high-priced treatment and prison space would offset those costs in the long run.

Our recommendation would be to fund prevention counselors at the middle school level. If we looked at Florida and looked at an estimate of cost in our State, that would cost about $18.9 million. If you nationalize that figure, using Florida's percentage that we've been getting of the Drug-Free Schools Act, that would be a national cost to take that program nationally at the same level of a prevention counselor per middle school, perhaps, in the area of $400 million plus.

This area of intervention for those students who are already using, we think, is an important next step and a follow-on to the drug awareness and education basic program that's been funded.

In summary, we have opened the innovative Prevention Center, the legislature mandated the Drug-Free Schools Program, we have extensive State networking systems working in concert with

parent, health and law enforcement organizations, as well as Federal, State, and local government agencies. We have a strong commitment from local education agencies to implement programs tailored to their communities.

We have some examples of promising approaches. As I mentioned, peer counseling, and community-wide partnerships, Florida has three programs that have been nationally recognized, two in Dade County and one in the center part of our State, for the kinds of peer counseling and community-wide, school-wide programs.

Ladies and gentlemen, the next step is really to fund and expand the commitment into the intervention programs. We might, on the funding arena, if the cost of going nationally and the cost of going statewide would be too high, we might also look at exploring high-intensity grants to those areas which are most at risk, that is, try or take that next step to intervention to those high-risk districts and high-risk students first.

Further, we need to strengthen evaluation. The Secretary mentioned that this morning. We are very much concerned about that, that we are making a difference in the choices that students make.

We have built evaluation into our grant program and into our plans the districts must file, but we simply must find the ways to assure that these dollars are making a difference in those choices.

The drug-free goals of this country will take the strongest partnership between all levels of government, between community groups, business groups, State, local, school district, Federal Government. That's why we welcome this opportunity to testify today and talk about some of the next steps we see in this very important program.

Thank you.

Chairman RANGEL. Thank you, Ms. Stryker.

[The testimony of Ms. Stryker appears on p. 80.]

Chairman RANGEL. Mr. McCord.

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM J. McCORD, DIRECTOR, COMMISSION ON ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND MEMBER, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE DIRECTORS

Mr. McCORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's a pleasure to be here. I recall in, I think, 1969, when I appeared before a House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to debate legislation offered by the late Congressman Eliot Hagen of Georgia, which preceeded the creation of the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. We had about 220 people in this field, and we were the experts. We were the experts on treatment, we hadn't even discovered what intervention was or prevention.

Sitting here today, I revised what I wanted to say. I'd give anything if this committee had been with me last Friday to celebrate the ending of one of our most powerful prevention strategies that's called the South Carolina Teen Institute on Alcohol and Drug Prevention. We bring in teams of students, funded with Drug-Free Schools money by the way, from each school with an adult advisor, where they come in and work and play as hard as they've ever in their life. There they build some self-confidence, and develop skills,

and develop a plan for the implementation of prevention strategies in their schools and their communities for the upcoming school year.

We had teams that were blind and deaf, we had teams from Columbia, South America, and those teams added a dimension that was a most powerful experience. They were the teachers, and not necessarily the learners.

The message they carried away was "we can make a difference." Now, it is important that Washington come up with a blueprint. Mr. Chairman, I've been waiting for 30 years for one and I'm still waiting for a blueprint from Washington. But, if Mr. Bennett, if Drug Czar Bennett is going to come up with a blueprint to win this war on drugs that does not represent the nature of the problem that is out there, then we don't need it. It is far more important to have a blueprint at the community level and at the State level than it is at Washington. But, if we have one at Washington, it should be consistent philosophically with what we know about prevention.

Prevention works. I believe it as passionately as I believed that treatment worked 30-years ago when I got in this field. It works, and we have technology, and we've got prevention professionals.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, they don't reside, I'm afraid, in the organizations that we are hearing from. It's happening, but, yet, in my system, and when Congress set up this national system, the "national blueprint," so called by legislation, Public Law 91-616 and Public Law 92-255, that's the Alcohol and the Drug Acts, it created a system of State Alcohol Drug Authorities, which as a prerequisite to being funded, had to develop a State plan that had to reflect local needs.

I'm from a State and I think it's working. I would like to invite you or any member of the whole committee to see prevention in place and working. Prevention is not the responsibility of the school. Prevention is the responsibility of the community and the school as a part of it. Yet today we hear talk as if the rest of the community does not exist.

This booklet, the red book until it had been revised this year, would not have been used in any program I recommended, because only one time in the previous edition of this was alcohol even mentioned as a drug, and in two South Carolina counties of around 500,000 people in the last 3 years, we've lost 44 kids under the age of 21 to alcohol-related traffic fatalities alone. This book tells me how to prevent drugs in the schools and yet doesn't recognize alcohol as a drug.

I commend the Secretary, particularly in his presentation and here (the red book), that alcohol has been incorporated, but only as—"Oh, yes, I just remember, alcohol is a drug."

In South Carolina, we know the ABC's of prevention. We know that the word alcohol comes before drugs. The term is alcohol and other drugs, and I beg this committee, not only to use that terminology, but to think in that terminology. That is the issue we've got to deal with.

What we know about prevention. We spend $2.1 million among State Alcohol Drug Authorities in alcohol drug prevention, intervention and treatment. This book does not even mention our

system as a resource. We spend far more money than is appropriated for the Drug-Free Schools.

The Drug-Free Schools is a piece of the puzzle, and it's only part of the resources that are out there. We need to talk about blending all of those resources and look at prevention and drug abuse problems as a community problem, not a school problem, and put it in context. To ask the schools to take the major initiative in providing the leadership to the community, is too much. This is a Public Health problem, not a Health and Human Services problem, it's a Public Health problem. No other illness or no other problem has been ever treated out of existence, you've got to prevent it.

Public Health professionals, basically, are where the prevention skills lie, and it does work.

Let me say this in conclusion. Prevention is like a piece of a jigsaw puzzle. We've talked about curriculum. We just designed one fantastic curriculum, it's K-12, it's called "Strategies," and it's for parents as well as students. But, until you have a message of prevention in the schools that is consistent with the messages reflected in the overall values of the community, it's not going to work, Mr. Chairman. I don't care how strong a curriculum you've got on alcohol and other drugs. When the kids hear the dangers of alcohol and how it is the number one problem with the young, and then drive out of their schools and see cold beer to go at every station, and turn on their tubes and watch Spuds McKenzie, "the party animal", that's the message for them, by the way, the message for the general public is, "Know when to say when."

We must challenge the number one drug pushers in this country, even though they are legal. There is no justification for targeting high-risk populations such as minorities, such as children, and such as women. We have got to challenge those messages.

Education is an answer. It's one answer. Where does education take place in the American community? Mainly, on the tube, and we need to begin to monitor the kind of messages that bombard our children, that talks everything but drug-free, because we are told generically that there is a chemical solution to all of life's problems, and the higher the dose, and the quicker the better. We are told that in order to have fun, to make out, it works every time, if you are feeling hot and having fun, don't slow down, drink Coor's Light, the party animal, party frenzy, those messages have to be challenged. That's education American style.

American youths worship the altar called sports and athletics, and who is serving communion? You look at it, you guessed it.

So, prevention works, we've got the technology, but we've got to make sure that what are the values that we are trying to instill within the school system are reflected in the overall values of the community. We've got to understand that prevention is far more complex than treatment. It took us 20 years to begin to understand treatment. Yet, we know it works, but we don't know why it works. Prevention works, but it's more complex.

Let me read these last two statements:

Recent evidence suggests that alcohol and other drug abuse among adolescents is associated with multiple risk and resiliency factors that are inherent within the environment, such as the availability of alcohol and other drugs, family, the media, schools, peer, the price, the availability. Right now we are dealing with the cocaine

six-pack equivalent in crack, a marketing strategy to make it more available and accessible to poor people and younger people, the six-pack equivalent. We've got to understand that. Also, the individual's interaction with the environment, as well as factors that are inherent within the individual, such as genetics, personality, physical health, or the absence of. Hence, any prevention intervention is likely to be more effective if it focuses on reducing the power of risk factors and increasing the potency of resilient factors among multiple environmental levels, such as a school.

Now, what all that means, and all that fancy language that the scientists have put together, is there are no simple solutions. Prevention must be comprehensive, it must be global, not in a geographic sense necessarily, but global and all encompassing, all that encompasses the community, and realize that even in the poorest of circumstances, in many cases, some of our strongest individuals emerge.

Prevention is believing you can make it and make a difference. These are human factors or host factors, and they are even more important than knowing all the facts about the dangers of alcohol or drugs. We've got to let the children of this country know and believe they can make it, and that's prevention. The issues of the resilient child and what we know, has a role in prevention.

We've got to clean up the environmental issues, not just on the highways, but what happens on our airways. We've got to involve the church in prevention. We've got to involve the whole fabric of the community. It works.

In summary, in my opinion, the Department of Education has not utilized all of the research in developing its guidelines for programs funded through the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act. For example, as we well know, only a couple of pages of this widely distributed publication relate to community prevention, and it causes a distortion about how prevention is going to happen. I would recommend that that part be enhanced to talk about the community's role as the principal focus of prevention, and the school in a secondary role, and the two must be reinforcing.

Chairman RANGEL. Mr. McCord, we're going to have to bring your testimony to a close, so that we'll be able to hear Mr. Zubrow——

Mr. MCCORD. Could I have a last sentence?

More money! We are fighting a wild fire, we are fighting a forest fire with pine tops. I know you've all got them in New York, so you know what I mean.

The Drug Czar has called for increased taxes. The great majority of the American public are willing to raise the excise tax on America's number one drug right now—alcohol we can do that, raise the price, at least over the price of a Coca Cola. We can't raise it enough to match the cost of what alcohol and other drugs do to our communities and our people, but we can raise it enough to provide a meaningful resource for prevention. I would recommend that you look toward the increase, looking at the issue of excise taxes dedicated to prevention. There will be no better investment of resources anywhere.

Thank you.

[The testimony of Mr. McCord appears on p. 90.]

Chairman RANGEL. Mr. Gilman, a member of this committee has introduced that same legislation.

Mr. Zubrow?

TESTIMONY OF EDWARD ZUBROW, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE SUPERINTENDENT, PHILADELPHIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS, ON BEHALF OF THE COUNCIL OF GREAT CITY SCHOOLS

Mr. ZUBROW. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. My name is Ed Zubrow, and I am the Special Assistant to the Superintendent of the Philadelphia Public Schools. I have responsibility for coordinating the school district's efforts in areas of drug prevention and our efforts as they relate to the city, where I sit on the mayor's Leadership Anti-Drug Council, and I'm fortunate within our school district to sit in the superintendent's cabinet.

With me is Gwen Porter, the project director for the school district's Office of Student Substance Abuse Programs, and we are pleased to appear before you this morning on behalf of the Council of Great City Schools.

On behalf of the council, I want to thank you for the invitation to testify before this crucial committee on Federal drug abuse policy in our schools, and also to thank you for your leadership and advocacy in this area.

With your permission, I would like to offer a few general observations about the Federal Government's response to our Nation's drug problems as they relate to the schools, particularly, those in our inner cities, and to describe in overview what we are doing in Philadelphia to address these challenges, and, finally, to discuss what we think remains to be done.

In general, Mr. Chairman, we would have to give the Federal Government a "C" grade for its leadership in preventing drug abuse in our schools. The previous administration, in particular, was not helpful in either its budget requests or its rhetoric. The attempt to halve the Congressional allocation for the Drug-Free Schools Act several years ago was outrageous, and the proposal to test our students for drugs was unfeasible. The administration's best effort probably was the publication of What Works: Schools Without Drugs.

While the new administration shows less overt hostility to our efforts in controlling drug abuse, it also shows little demonstrable leadership. Too little has emerged from the Department of Education to date to demonstrate that it takes this problem seriously. Its budget request was woefully inadequate, and it's proposals largely uncreative. We have not seen from the Department of Education yet any serious evidence of commitment for addressing the drug problem or any description of how it fits into the administration's overall purported war on drugs.

Respectfully, I would submit that too many of the model curricula that were passed down to us are inappropriate for urban schools in multicultural settings, with urban children. We, in the cities, are in the best position at the local level to work with our communities to adopt models that work. What we need from the Federal Government is research, development support, not pre-packaged blueprints.

One proposal from the Department, however, that deserves serious attention by Congress is its Drug-Free Schools Urban Emergency Grants, as contained in H.R. 1675. This bill would authorize $25 million in one-time grants for urban school systems having the

most severe drug problems. Communities of every kind are experiencing problems with drug use, but the situation in our major cities is staggering. While this proposal is small, it would provide assistance where the need is greater and would correct, in part, one of the deficiencies in the current Drug-Free Schools Act, the lack of targeting.

Congress currently appropriates about $354.5 million nationally for the drug abuse education efforts under the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, of which inner-city schools receive about $13.7 million or 4 percent—in contrast to the 12 percent of the Nation's students they enroll, most of whom are those highly at risk for drug use. Not only is the $9—on average—spent per child by the Federal Government inadequate to address the Nation's drug problems, but the $3.50 spent for each urban child borders on the scandalous. In short, the Federal education effort short changes the area where the problem is most acute: the cities.

Despite this deficiency in Federal support, local urban schools are grappling with their drug problems with energy, creativity, and commitment, using funds from a wide variety of sources, including the Drug-Free Schools Act. In Philadelphia, we are using a five-point strategy that includes: prevention and intervention programs, community outreach, staff development and training, school board policy, and cooperative ventures with law enforcement and other city agencies. Our total budget for these efforts is approximately $1,422,375 in 1988-89. This budget reflects contributions from the school district, city, State, and corporate community. The Federal portion of this is approximately $520,000 or 36.5 percent.

In the area of prevention education, the Philadelphia Public Schools teach standardized curricula to all children in grades K-12 on substance abuse through our Department of Health and Physical Education. This effort is supplemented by a variety of other education projects, including:

Here's Looking At You—2000, a State approved drug and alcohol abuse prevention curriculum for students grades K-6. Emphasis is placed on social skills, bonding, refusal skills, and understanding the effects of chemical dependence.

Project Pride, a program in our schools run by the Jewish Family and Children's Service Agency targeted at middle school youngsters. It uses peer support groups to exert positive peer pressure to help kids learn how to say no.

We work with a nationally-known cooperative venture called Project DARE, in which Philadelphia uniformed police teach a prevention curriculum. In Philadelphia, the police are staunch allies in our efforts to reduce the number of people they might otherwise have to arrest in future years.

We also attempt to provide a number of programs emphasizing intervention and referral. Typical of these are:

Rites of Passage Program in the high schools, a program reaching about 48,000 youth each year, designed to deliver prevention and early intervention services through peer group counseling.

Particularly encouraging is the Student Assistance Program, which trains school faculty to identify substance abuse problems and provide appropriate referrals to the drug and alcohol and mental health systems. Teams of administrators, nurses, counselors

and teachers are trained in adolescent chemical dependence, group work, recovery and aftercare, and become crucial supports in our endeavor to catch those of our students about to succumb to drugs, help them gain access to treatment, and support them upon their return to school.

Our schools attempt to work closely with the community through two other efforts:

Operation Kinship, which provides workshops, seminars and training sessions for parents, community groups, churches and other organizations.

Teenage Parents Program, providing prevention and early intervention strategies and services to 300 pregnant and parenting teens who are substance abusers living in public housing or shelters.

Staff development has been mentioned and is crucial. The Philadelphia School District is implementing an ongoing staff development effort with the goal of helping all faculty and nonteaching personnel recognize signs of abuse and assist children suffering from the effects of drugs. No longer does any teacher have the luxury of simply teaching subject matter, all must be trained to cope with this problem.

The Philadelphia Board of Education has enacted new policies banning the possession by students of beepers, expelling students for incidents involving drugs and weapons, and establishing a "Security Operations Task Force" to investigate any drug activity in the schools.

Finally, the Philadelphia Public Schools seek active collaboration with other agencies to fight drugs and provide leadership. We are attempting to do this through a concept we call:

Drug-Free School Zones. In this project, we challenge each school to use the area designated around schools of 1,000 feet, to call attention to Federal legislation and establish a "zero tolerance" policy in this zone. We are attempting to do this by coordinating efforts with the Police Department, District Attorney's Office, the U.S. Attorney's Office, as well as community leaders. Next year, each principal will be responsible to explain his school-based plan for Drug-Free School Zones as part of his overall school improvement plan.

Partnerships form a major component of our work, as we have developed cooperative agreements with the regional health care providers, the social service delivery system and the private sector. This concept is being developed in many diverse ways including the SAP program, and our participation in the Corporate Alliance for Drug Education (CADE). We know that alone no agency, including the schools, can prevail in this fight. We must truly work together to serve our children.

Efforts in Philadelphia are similar to those in other city public school systems across the Nation. Previous programs designed solely to teach our youth about the dangers of drugs or to raise self-confidence had positive effects but were not sufficient to reduce drug use significantly, leading many to think that education efforts were ineffective.

Quite the opposite is true, however, when those educational efforts use peer pressure. Education programs in these cases were particularly effective in reducing the initial use of "gateway"

drugs—an important predictor of later use. Evaluations of the ALERT program in California, the STAR program in Kansas City, and the Seattle Social Development Project appear to bear this out. Recent research reviews of some 240 studies also showed that drug abuse education, based mostly in schools, was effective when it used a strong peer component in reducing drug abuse.

The evaluations of these efforts nationwide indicate that drug abuse education can work, especially when it goes beyond simply providing information to becoming an active, integral part of a comprehensive community education program.

In short, Mr. Chairman, we are convinced that the drug abuse education efforts in our schools are an essential component in the Nation's overall strategy against drugs. The Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act is an important part of our efforts locally.

Evaluations of specific efforts on student drug use will be ready at the end of the next school year, but our preliminary findings demonstrate that well over 90 percent of our program's participants have rated the experience as highly positive, and a survey which we took last spring among our teachers indicates that over 85 percent of them believe we can make a difference.

But, to do it, we need help. Much more needs to be done at our level and yours. We see first hand every day the effects that these drugs have on our youth. Today, too may of our inner-city youth are being lost in this never-ending maelstrom of despair, drugs, poverty, neglect, abuse, violence, and isolation.

Tomorrow, we are awaiting the arrival in our school system of as many as 5,000 babies born in Philadelphia last year handicapped by their mothers' substance abuse.

The Federal Government could be more helpful to us at the local level if it would consider the following recommendations:

a. Increase the funding for the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to $1 billion annually.

b. Modify the current Drug-Free Schools authorization to distribute 95 percent—rather than 75 percent—of its funds to the local school system level.

c. Target funds under the Drug-Free Schools Act to areas of high poverty using the Chapter 1 formula.

d. Require the Department of Education to develop and test more program models for dissemination at the local level.

e. Provide funds to the Department of Education for curricula development and teacher training packages for dissemination at the local level.

f. Authorize Federal funds for school-based health clinics that would provide more health education, health care and drug monitoring for our students and for the babies of our students.

g. Encourage the Secretary of Education to provide national leadership in the schools' role in drug abuse prevention.

h. Place greater emphasis on school-based prevention programs in the Secretary's discretionary fund.

i. Incorporate drug abuse education in other Federal programs, for example, nutrition education, AIDS prevention, Chapter 2, day care and teen pregnancy programs, and programs serving infants born to chemically addicted parents.

j. Retain but do not expand the current Federal requirements for local assurances on drug policies.

k. Approve the administration's urban schools emergency grants.

Thank you very much for this opportunity to testify.

I would be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman RANGEL. Thank you, Mr. Zubrow.

[The testimony of Mr. Zubrow appears on p. 109.]

Chairman RANGEL. You are a member of the Council of Great City Schools?

Mr. ZUBROW. I am representing them. I work for the school district of Philadelphia.

Chairman RANGEL. Has the Council of Great City Schools met with the Secretary, or have you had conferences in Washington, sharing the problems of urban schools?

Mr. ZUBROW. I'm sure that the Council and its representatives can provide specifics of when or if such meetings have been. My experience has been in Philadelphia.

Chairman RANGEL. So, you haven't—you don't know of any national conferences of the schools?

Mr. ZUBROW. No, sir.

Chairman RANGEL. Ms. Porter, do you know of any?

Ms. PORTER. No, sir.

Chairman RANGEL. Well, Mr. Hays, why don't you just sit up here with us, because this is not going to be as formal as I think.

Here we find——

Mr. HAYS. I really must leave, Mr. Chairman. I stayed as long as I could.

Chairman RANGEL. Well, you've got the gist of the testimony. I think all three witnesses believe that we could have more national leadership from the Congress, as well as the Secretary's office.

They are prepared to share what they are doing that's good, and we all have to know that. I would encourage you to see whether we can bring in State education officials and, perhaps, those from the urban communities, the rural communities, the school superintendents, and if you want congressional support, you've got it. If you don't, you can do it your way.

But, it's going to be important, these are our front-line troops. When they come back to their home base in Washington and say they are hurting, we like to at least know that there's a blueprint so that we can hold them accountable to see whether they are doing the things that the Secretary thinks we should be doing.

I really appreciate the fact that you stayed far longer than we had thought.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, we will work closely with you, and we appreciate your support.

Chairman RANGEL. Very good.

Your messages come across loud and clear. We hope that we can provide a forum in support of developing a national strategy.

We know, Mr. McCord, that no national strategy that doesn't reflect community needs isn't going to work, and, certainly, I think the Secretary has indicated that he agrees with you that alcoholism is our number one problem.

Mr. Zubrow, if the Secretary doesn't bring together our urban educators, I'm going to do it. This committee is going to do it. We

were able to organize local and State law enforcement. We thought it was important. We didn't think that was the solution, just putting people in jail at $40,000.00 a year coverage. We think increasing intervention and dealing with at-risk students are just as important, but you don't change things by hoping for it to happen. The police chiefs, and the foot patrolmen, they came out throughout the United States, got to their Members of Congress, and over the resistance of the administration they won.

Now, we're trying to get the Attorney General to hold them accountable. We don't even know what they are doing with the money, you know, and so, it hasn't stopped yet.

I promise you that we're going to try to get the Secretary to meet with State commissioners, and city chancellors, and see what works, but we'll have enough time to come back if we can't do it.

Mr. ZUBROW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I'm told by the representative of the staff of the Great City Schools that such an invitation has not been forthcoming from the Secretary, so we appreciate your interest in advocating that such a group be convened.

Chairman RANGEL. Well, I'm going to ask staff to prepare a letter, and I hope Mr. Coughlin, after we discuss it further, would see fit to join with me in asking the Secretary to meet with our State commissioners, and the chiefs and commissioners of our city schools, and whatever the counterpart is for suburban and rural schools in America also have a forum, so that, we can have an exchange. We don't want to substitute the Federal Government for local government, but we can't have a blueprint unless there's input.

Mr. McCord.

Mr. MCCORD. Mr. Chairman, I beg you, when you design this meeting, I think it would be tremendous if you could do this at a national level. There is a constituency out there, the alcohol and drug system, that has much more money in prevention than we're talking about here. Please, in your design of that conference, ask for the State Alcohol and Drug Authority who develops that State plan, who already has some blueprint to be included with your conference.

Chairman RANGEL. That makes a lot of sense, because that's the way it is set up in New York.

Mr. Coughlin.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

We certainly appreciate all of you taking the time to be here, and your testimony, indeed.

I've got three questions to which I would like each of you to respond very briefly if you can.

First, are your jurisdictions using the Department of Education audiovisual aids that have been provided to school districts throughout the country? I would be interested in any reaction you have to these films.

Second, I assume that you would all like to receive more Federal dollars, and I can certainly understand that. Mr. Zubrow has recommended some changes but I'd like to hear from Ms. Stryker and Mr. McCord as to specific programmatic changes that we might recommend be made to Secretary Cavazos or Director Bennett?

Third, do you believe you are receiving satisfactory State funding for drug abuse education in the schools? I would appreciate your comments on those three things.

Ms. Stryker.

Ms. STRYKER. On the audiovisual aids, we have copies of those, and we've provided them for the school districts, but we've acted more as a clearinghouse. As far as how much they are actually being used out there, I don't have it specifically. We've acted as a way of getting those materials out.

I mentioned in my testimony that we do have a Conference of Health curriculum, of which the drug and alcohol abuse items were incorporated as part of that curriculum, and there's many materials that are being used, but I don't have specific information there.

On the program changes, I think in my testimony this area of moving to intervention, that it is a more costly part of the program, and that's not really being taken into account now.

The evaluation requires, I think, that the Federal Government needs to strengthen their role.

The other part, the 70/30, we would also suggest that it be looked at, and, perhaps, more dollars go to the school level. As I said, our State is about 85 percent urban, so the $9 that was discussed is spread rather thin at $3.74. We have 82,000 new students coming into our schools this year, so as a growth State, as Congressman Lewis and Grant well know, Florida has that special problem.

On State funding, we have done a number of things. First, we have a School Resource Officer Program in the schools that have been our front line on really helping the schools deal with a myriad of law enforcement related programs, but they are also supposed to do partially education programs. That's been a strong one.

The whole area of dropout prevention, one of our specific areas of dropout prevention funding, which we have about $120 million statewide, is to deal with adjudicated youth, which has heavily been students that have been arrested for either selling or using drugs. So, those would be some of the programs I would just point out.

I think on the State level, our problem is that we're growing so rapidly as a State, that just paying for new students is one of our biggest challenges. So, when you see the intensity that we are experiencing as being that front door of where drugs are coming in, that our State is—it's a real challenge just to pay for the kind of student growth that we have.

Mr. MCCORD. The first issue, audiovisual, there's a much better way to spend money. We are no match in the audiovisual output or media advertising other messages that are coming. It's basically reflective of what we thought prevention was 20-years ago. That's not our principal need. There's a better bang for the buck than to put it in audiovisual materials, even though they certainly are useful.

Programmatic changes, one, the U.S. Department of Education needs to get out of Washington, visit and see programs, experience programs that are working and understand what the rest of the team is out there. I don't see that happening. For years, and years and years I've been coming and sitting on panels at national meetings, going back to Doctor Helen Nollis era and talk about lack of

coordination, we still hear we don't coordinate. We still don't coordinate. There still doesn't seem to be an awareness of who is out there to help you in this war. War is not won by individual armies, it's won by people working together. We don't work together, and that is a basic deficiency of the Federal leadership in not bringing it together.

The Federal establishment doesn't speak to each other today. Even today, the National Institute of Drug Abuse, the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse, still don't have the same definition of what prevention is. They still don't use the same technique. One uses a Public Health approach, one doesn't. One is the A wing, one in the C wing. They tried to solve that by putting ADAMHA and put them together.

OSAP ought to be involved much more prominently, OSAP and the Alcohol Drug Public Health constituency, in working with the Department of Education.

While the 70/30 may be an equitable split for drug education dollars, but realizing the schools are a part of an overall community program, there's not nearly enough money in the 30 percent aid. Either change it—don't change it 50/50, because we're robbing Peter to pay Paul, and we're only shooting ourselves in the foot. Give us enough resources to do the job, and if we don't, then we ought to stop talking about it.

A war without bullets and without ammunition, is going to be nothing but rhetoric, and, unfortunately, there's been a lot of political rhetoric on the issue of drug abuse going on without necessary follow through. We've got to find a way to access new resources into the ball game. How to do that with Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, I don't know, that's your specialty, some sort of trust fund or what. I recommend that we've got to talk about how to access the private sector of the community and to blend the best of the know how of the public system, and the capability and the freedom to act on a timely basis of the private sector into a coordinated approach. We're doing that with setting up a foundation in South Carolina. I'm tired of waiting for Congress or whoever else, or the States, to appropriate money in prevention. We will build prison beds far more quickly in the public sector than we will fund prevention programs.

That's basically it. The other thing is, there's a huge reservoir of untapped resources that now go to law enforcement. Attorney General Meese about 4-years ago said, "We are going to be able to use some of this confiscated money from the drug pushers in demand reduction." He changed his mind. That needs to be looked at, at least account for how the money is spent now. But, that is a valuable source of new revenue, for the illicit drugs that they would do, and illicit drugs have also some capability of providing you resources that I have already addressed.

Mr. COUGHLIN. That's a little bit out of the sphere of this.

Mr. Zubrow.

Mr. ZUBROW. I will ask Ms. Porter to talk about the videotapes and how she and her office have sought to adapt this national videotape to a school system where over 70 languages are spoken.

But, I do want to point out that even the most effective 30-minute video presentation is competing with what children see in

their environment 24-hours a day, and it's competing, as Mr. McCord pointed out, with the very skillful presentation on television, not only of the advertisements, but the programmers as well.

Ms. PORTER. One of the problems of the video was that we received 15 and we have 279 schools. There's a cost factor to purchase those videotapes, and they run about $125 a piece. With 279 schools, that can be an exorbitant amount of money just for audio-visual materials.

There's also a need to address multicultural populations, which these videotapes do not do. We have an Asian community in Philadelphia that's fighting the crack and cocaine war. We have a black and Hispanic population, whites, everyone in our community are dealing with this drug problem. So, when we look at it, we don't need to look at it in one facet, but we need materials that address all populations, and I think that needs to be taken into consideration.

Our office, we share these materials as we get them from the Secretary's office, however, there are not enough of them.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RANGEL. Thank you, Mr. Coughlin.

Mr. Lewis?

Mr. LEWIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Nice to see you again, Ms. Stryker, it's been a long time.

I have a couple of questions I would like to ask all three of you, and first I would like to ask you the question about the advertising. I have heard this from a number of people, and, certainly, just a few weeks ago talking with some young people in rehabilitation programs, their concerns were the same as you expressed, Mr. McCord, and felt that they receive their initial initiation into drugs, and, particularly, into alcohol, which was their start, and then into harder narcotics, was because of the advertising, and it was the cool and the in thing to do, and I'm talking about 15, 16, and 17 year old girls and boys.

How do you propose that something could be done about the advertising, taking into consideration Supreme Court rulings of days, Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Expression, it seems that's the greatest crutch we have anymore. Every time legislation is proposed, either at the State, local or Federal level, it's tested in court and in most cases defeated.

What do you think? We're anxious to do something about this, but we certainly cannot infringe upon the constitutional rights of anybody. What do you think is the best approach, something other than requesting the advertiser to do it. Now, this has helped in some questionable——

Mr. MCCORD. I've been working on this for the last 15-years of my career. I used to think we could get the industry to alter its own advertising practices, and there have been slight gains, such as Miller Brewing Co. this year withdrawing an insert that went into all college papers which was grossly exploitive, and sexist. They actually apologized for it.

I wish that I could say in good faith that the industry would police itself. In a democratic society that's the way it should happen. I don't think it will happen and I don't think it can happen fast enough.

As far as the constitutional protection of the Freedom of Speech, it does not have the same guarantees for commercial Freedom of Speech that it does for private. I don't think that there is any question that if it were brought to the courts, there are ample precedents that would allow for an actual ban or at least equal time for a counter message.

I would either say, either ban it or give us the public health constituents, the prevention people, equal time, equal time to bring in the true facts is enough.

All a child has to do is drink a beer to know that it contains a drug. You don't have to tell them, you don't have to teach them. The adolescent brain doesn't differ between what is legal and what is illegal. It still has a devastating effect. So, when you deal with one drug, you are dealing with all. So, alcohol advertising sets the stage for drug use and abuse and other things, too.

Legislation to require equal time would be sufficient. That would get the ads off the air. That's what took tobacco ads off the air.

Mr. ZUBROW. I agree that we already see some regulation, and, therefore, there should be no reason why there can't be more regulation of commercial advertising. I think we should look at the budgets and recognize that not only is the "Know when to say when" a token, but its relative place in the overall advertising budget demonstrates that, and I would express our particular concern at a trend in the advertising of alcohol and cigarettes to target poor communities, young people, and, I would add, developing nations.

The Philadelphia Inquirer reported in a 2.2 mile section of Ridge Avenue, which runs through some of our poorer communities, there were 56 billboard advertisements featuring black and Hispanic factors for cigarettes and alcohol, so that's the concern with what our kids are seeing.

Ms. STRYKER. I'd like to comment, and, again, it's good to see you as well. I enjoyed working with you when you were in the Florida Legislature a great deal.

I would point out in our student and drug survey, that the growing, the first use of alcohol today that we're seeing with students in the 10 and 11-year old's, very early use, is wine coolers. They challenge the adage, remember when we were growing up you acquired a taste for beer, and alcohol was that terrible stuff, it tasted awful. But, wine coolers have changed that, and that sweet drink, it, again, has a very strong youth advertisement, and our findings here was, that was what students were using.

Mr. MCCORD. It's no longer called a wine cooler, it's called a cooler, period.

Ms. PORTER. We found, through the initial evaluation of our Here's Looking at You: 2000 Program, that in the fourth grade children use wine coolers. If you go into an assembly program and say, how many of you are addicted to drugs, no hands will go up. If you ask the children, how many of you have had a wine cooler, every hand will go up, and we have to begin teaching young people more about gateway drugs, and the advertisement has a tremendous impact on that.

Mr. MCCORD. There is a legitimate role to play with dealing with legal drugs. We have seen the precedent in that dealing with

Valium and Librium when we had a national epidemic. In my State and I think nationally, most prescription drug abuse has dramatically gone down. We've got model programs. It's not a matter of doing away with it, we're not advocating going back to Prohibition, that didn't work then and it won't work now, but we've got to work with them—the industry—in a more meaningful way, and it's got to be an honest dialogue.

The only trouble is, the best customer of the alcoholic beverage industry is the best customer of treatment programs. We have a common clientele.

Mr. LEWIS. Okay, thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I have one further question, but I'll defer that for a write in.

Thank you.

Chairman RANGEL. Mr. Grant.

Mr. GRANT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

To Commissioner Stryker, it's good to you see again, Laurey, and I am pleased to tell this committee that our Department of Education in Florida doesn't sit back and wait. They are proactive, and we're very proud of Laurey and Commissioner Castor for the work they've done.

Mr. Zubrow, one point of your testimony intrigues me, and this whole issue of the so-called "war on drugs" has been kin to trying to pick up Jello. Intuitively, you know you can do it, but you just don't know how to get a good handle on it. Your cooperative ventures with other agencies, which was outlined in your testimony, indicated that you have some partnerships that have been successful.

As I read in your testimony, you say that drug abuse education is effective when it's used, and I guess that's a caveat, when it's used as a component in a communitywide program.

I guess my question is, what comes first, what drives it? Do you start the communitywide program and then try to supplement it with the education arm, which has a couple other points I want to ask, too.

Mr. ZUBROW. I think that the thing that comes first in any team endeavor, I used to be in athletics, I was a college football coach, in any cooperative endeavor, the thing that has to come first is leadership, and that's what we are looking to the Federal Government for, leadership that, indeed, we recognize the severity and the depth of this problem and what it's doing to children in the cities and throughout the country.

Then we can rally around that leadership to try to work together, because we don't have it figured out. Those cooperative ventures, as with any team or cooperative venture, have their ups and downs. That's what working together is all about, but we're trying to build relationships that will help.

I would illustrate it by talking about the presence of the Philadelphia police and the schools, and highlight on a day in which a uniformed patrolman was explaining his uniform to the children of—elementary school children, and one little boy raised his hand and said to the officer, when the officer had shown his handcuffs, and the boy said, "How come you came to my house last night and took my Daddy away in handcuffs?" The officer got down on his

knees and gave the child a big hug, and said, "Your Daddy was doing something that was harmful to him and to other people, and we can't let him do that."

I would submit that that's good education. That's important for the kids. It's equally important when that officer goes back to the station house. There's now even more of a human element to what's going on.

So, cooperation has to happen in lots of ways, and it can't be putting a blueprint from the top down. What can be, though, is the leadership and the support to empower people in the cities and in the communities to search for ways to work together and find out what works best in that neighborhood.

Mr. GRANT. Well, that's basically what I'm asking, have you been successful in Philadelphia or in any of these other programs, because as a former coach you understand there are rules to play by, and what the chairman and this committee are trying to do is to find out what the rules ought to be. If you've got a formula that's working, we want to know about it, because, hopefully, then, we can implement it in other places.

We'll find leaders, because I don't think there's a single person in this Congress that's not convinced of the enormity of the problem. It's just that we're trying to get a handle on it, and no one is able yet, at least in my experience to come to us and say, this categorically, definitely works, this works. If we knew what Philadelphia was doing, if it was—I like what you say about self-esteem and self-concept, being used in conjunction with education programs, being used in conjunction with the community-based or communitywide program. If that really works, then you tell us.

Mr. ZUBROW. One of the problems that I think we all encounter in this complex area is that, we look for what definitively works, but we need to realize that what works in South Carolina may not work in New York City, and what works in south Philadelphia may not work in northeast Philadelphia.

See, we fall prey to a little bit of the same psychology that leads us into some of these problems in the first place, and that's the psychology of the artificial fix, the imposed fix, the quick fix.

Mr. GRANT. Well, I understand that. So, this is a Congress, so don't chastise us about not having the national blueprint, but at the same time tell us, you know, tell us what works in your area, and maybe you are telling us we need to regionalize our program.

Mr. ZUBROW. Recognizing that we can't teach our way out of it in the classroom, we've done some interesting things, and I'm going to ask Gwen to comment on some conferences that we're running to try to use our expertise as educators in the community to answer that specifically.

Ms. PORTER. It has been extremely important to bring community leaders into the schools, grassroots community people who live in the various communities, and get information from them about the problems they are facing, how they need the schools to work with them.

One of the areas was training, and we were able to train community groups in the various curriculum techniques that we use to enhance their skills to identify, intervene and refer kids in their community to treatment centers, to help pregnant and parenting teens

and adults realize the impact of alcohol and other drugs of abuse on their unborn children.

We also stress the importance of collaboration, because between the schools and the community groups there's a distrust, and we are working to improve the trust factors, so that parents and people in the community no longer see us as a separate entity, but as a part of the overall community.

So, basically, we are at the beginning stages of an integrated circular model where the schools go out to the community, and the community comes into the schools. Agencies supply us with additional in-kind services. We go out and provide them with educational training.

This has given us a more humanistic look to the drug and alcohol treatment agencies, the social service agencies, agencies that deal with young people. We have gone into the churches and we've said to the churches, hello, you have a Never Alone Group, we'll come out and train your pastoral council in skills, and we have this service. So, what can we offer you, and what can you give us that will enhance that relationship. And, they know what's going on, and they can give us problems with families and children that we don't see after 3:30.

Mr. GRANT. Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, I've used up all my time.

May I just say one final thing. I heard testimony in another committee last year, and I think the figure was something like $500 million that we had appropriated, maybe that's too much, for the Department of Education, and they didn't even have a curriculum framework as a proposal for school systems, and that's what I'm asking you to do. Before you ask us to send more money, tell us what really works.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RANGEL. I'd like to say the same thing in different ways. As I said, I'm going to encourage the Secretary to try to get input from the different groups, but that doesn't mean that your council can't have its own conference and share with each other, as was pointed out, what is working in south Philadelphia because it may work in the South Bronx. What you are doing in north Philadelphia may work in Staten Island. The good things that are happening in Florida may work in South Carolina.

I don't know whether it's the Council of Urban Schools, or whether it's the State Education Directors, but it's clear to me that whatever blueprint the government has, just like the House of Representatives, it is going to have to represent a constituency.

I think the American people are way ahead of the Congress in terms of demanding that we do something, but I know one thing, the educators are not. We don't find this overwhelming demand that we have to respond to you, the custodian of our youth. We don't find an overwhelming demand from the ministers in terms of the spiritual nature of what's happening to our children born addicted to drugs. Whoever is in charge of the prison systems, they are being heard. I mean, the President will be on the steps of the Capitol for more Federal prisons, and all our Governors will be asking for death penalties or mandatory life sentences, so they are being heard because they have a constituency.

I hope that staff prepares letters to your group, to the State commissioner groups, to the urban groups, and see what they are doing, and then we'll get in touch with the Secretary of Education to see what he is doing in order to establish communication, and if we don't find these groups coming together, I think we in the Congress might have to coordinate our own all-day conference concluding with a hearing where they would. Mr. Grant, report to us their findings, not only educators, but as Mr. McCord pointed out, those people that the states have who deal specifically with alcohol and drug abuse.

I hope that this initiative is going to be snatched away from us by the Administration or by Mr. Bennett, but I can assure you that if they don't we'll make certain it does happen.

This is a very distinguished panel. You've made a great contribution, and I recognize Ms. Stryker.

Ms. STRYKER. Mr. Chairman, I think that suggestion of getting people together on what they are finding, and what are the most successful kinds of programs, is a very good suggestion, because in Florida we have done this. We have—one of the strategies we took as a State Department is to set up a sharing success program, that is, find the schools that were doing it right, and having the success, have the evaluation, document that, share it. We have had a conference each year that has been highly successful, and helped us develop those next steps, and that's how specifically we came up with the need on intervention as being the next step.

Mr. MCCORD. Mr. Chairman, could I make one closing statement?

The future for prevention is coalition building, be it in Washington, but the most important place that it be built is at the local level.

The question is, who is to assume the leadership? And, we've been in that role historically, and I think we're willing to do it.

We have a National Prevention Network, which is allied with NASADAD, whose whole job is to replicate programs that work.

If I had my druthers now, I would rather see this committee and selected other organizations get together, not in a hearing such as this, but in a roll-up-the-sleeves work session, and say let's put it together, at least start talking the same language.

Right now in this field, we are beginning to see the language coming together that we understand each other in our constituencies, and have set some common goals.

But, the whole issue in prevention is coalition building. We are organizing a state coalition of organizations, some 50 organizations from the medical society to the NAACP, from the Junior League to the Urban League, of putting them together to talk about alcohol drug-safe communities. We're not going to wait on that blueprint, we're going to come up with our own. We'd be happy to share that with you, because we believe we've got enough that works now that we can really make a dramatic difference in the next 5 to 10 years.

Chairman RANGEL. Well, that's good, but the President has made a national call, and I think he's done it in an eloquent and dramatic way, and I do hope that we find his Cabinet responding to that declaration.

But, the Congress, we only have 2-year contracts, and we're going to have to respond if we don't hear and see the leadership. So, you may want to comment on that, Mr. Coughlin.

Mr. McCORD. Keeps you sensitive.

Chairman RANGEL. But, let me thank you for being what we consider to be our front-line troops. We can do all the declaration of war that we want, but you are the ones that are fighting it and doing the best that you can for our children.

We're spending a lot of money putting these kids in jail, a lot of money, and they are going right back to jail when they get out. If we can listen to you more carefully, I am certain that prevention and education are less expensive in the long run, and it strengthens our national security to have productive citizens in the years ahead.

Thank you so much.

The committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:26 p.m., the Select Committee adjourned.]

PREPARED STATEMENTS

OPENING STATEMENT OF

THE HONORABLE CHARLES B. RANGEL

CHAIRMAN

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

HEARING ON EDUCATING AMERICA'S YOUTH AGAINST DRUGS:

THE FEDERAL DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION STRATEGY

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 1989

9:00 A.M.

GOOD MORNING.

TODAY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL WILL REVIEW THE FEDERAL STRATEGY FOR DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION.

SEVERAL WEEK AGO, THE SELECT COMMITTEE MET PRIVATELY WITH U.S. EDUCATION SECRETARY LAURO CAVAZOS. AT THAT TIME HE PROMISED TO RETURN BEFORE THE AUGUST DISTRICT WORK PERIOD TO OUTLINE PUBLICLY THE STRATEGY HIS DEPARTMENT IS PURSUING TO EDUCATE OUR NATION'S YOUTH AGAINST THE DANGERS OF DRUGS.

MR. SECRETARY, WE WELCOME YOU BACK. UNTIL TODAY, HUD SECRETARY KEMP WAS THE ONLY OTHER BUSH CABINET OFFICIAL TO TESTIFY BEFORE OUR COMMITTEE ON HIS DEPARTMENT'S ANTI-DRUG STRATEGY, DISCUSSING THE AGGRESSIVE STEPS HE IS TAKING TO RID PUBLIC HOUSING OF THE SCOURGE OF DRUGS.

MR. SECRETARY, WE COMMEND YOU FOR RECOGNIZING THAT THE DRUG CRISIS IS TOO SERIOUS, AND THE NEED FOR A FEDERAL DRUG EDUCATION STRATEGY TOO IMPORTANT, TO WAIT FOR DRUG DIRECTOR BENNETT TO COMPLETE HIS DRUG STRATEGY. THERE ARE THINGS THAT OUR GOVERNMENT HAS TO DO TO HELP GET DRUGS OUT OF OUR SCHOOLS SO THAT OUR CHILDREN CAN LEARN AND GROW TO THEIR FULL POTENTIAL. THERE ARE THINGS OUR GOVERNMENT MUST DO TO

MAKE SURE OUR CHILDREN GET A CLEAR, UNEQUIVOCAL MESSAGE THAT ILLEGAL DRUG USE IS WRONG AND HARMFUL, TO THEMSELVES AND SOCIETY AS A WHOLE.

CONGRESS DID NOT CREATE MR. BENNETT'S POSITION TO HAVE OUR DRUG POLICY COME TO A HALT WHILE WE WAIT FOR HIM TO PUNCH OUT HIS TABLETS ON TOP OF THE MOUNTAIN. WE LOOK FORWARD TO HEARING THE POLICIES AND STRATEGIES YOU HAVE DEVELOPED TO CARRY OUT YOUR DEPARTMENT'S IMPORTANT ROLE IN DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION.

WE ALSO WELCOME TODAY STATE AND LOCAL DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION AND PREVENTION OFFICIALS WHO WILL TELL US ABOUT THEIR EFFORTS TO ESTABLISH EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS.

AS A NATION, AND AS FEDERAL POLICYMAKERS, THE DRUG SITUATION WE FIND OURSELVES IN TODAY IS PERILOUS INDEED. REPORTS FROM THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS AT ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT CONFIRM WHAT WE ALREADY KNOW FROM THE MOUNTING TOLL OF DRUG DEVASTATION AND DESPAIR THAT WE SEE EVERY DAY IN OUR CITIES AND COMMUNITIES. THE PRODUCTION OF ILLICIT DRUG CROPS ABROAD CONTINUES TO ESCALATE; THE TONNAGE OF COCAINE AND OTHER DRUGS BEING SMUGGLED INTO OUR COUNTRY CONTINUES TO INCREASE; AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT IS BEING OVERWHELMED BY CHEAP, PLENTIFUL AND POTENT SUPPLIES OF DRUGS WHICH ARE FUELING RAPID INCREASES IN DRUG-RELATED CRIME AND VIOLENCE.

CLEARLY, WE NEED TO DO MUCH MORE TO STEM THE SUPPLY OF DRUGS. BUT IT COMES AS NO SURPRISE THAT MANY DRUG EXPERTS, ESPECIALLY THOSE IN DRUG ENFORCEMENT, ARE CALLING FOR MORE ATTENTION TO REDUCING THE DEMAND FOR DRUGS.

CONGRESS HAS APPROPRIATED INCREASED FUNDING TO EXPAND DRUG TREATMENT, BUT THE AVAILABILITY OF TREATMENT REMAINS WOEFULLY INADEQUATE. AND DESPITE THE MILLIONS OF DOLLARS WE ARE SPENDING ON TO TREAT DRUG USERS, TREATMENT STILL FAILS TO HELP TOO MANY ADDICTS WHO ARE TRYING TO KICK THEIR HABITS.

OUR BEST HOPE, THEN, TO REDUCE THE DEMAND FOR DRUGS IS DRUG EDUCATION AND PREVENTION. WE NEED TO STOP DRUG USE BEFORE IT GETS STARTED. THIS WILL REQUIRE A MASSIVE EFFORT DIRECTED ESPECIALLY AT OUR YOUNG PEOPLE.

THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986 AUTHORIZED THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT WHICH, FOR THE FIRST TIME, PROVIDED SUBSTANTIAL FEDERAL FUNDING FOR COMPREHENSIVE DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND MANDATED A STRONGER LEADERSHIP ROLE IN SUCH EFFORTS BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. NEARLY THREE YEARS HAVE PASSED SINCE CONGRESS INITIATED AND ENACTED THIS HISTORIC LEGISLATION. THAT ACT AND SUBSEQUENT AMENDMENTS, HOWEVER, REPRESENT ONLY THE FIRST STEP IN WHAT MUST BE A LONG-TERM COMMITMENT TO DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION.

TODAY, WE WANT TO REVIEW HOW THIS ACT IS BEING IMPLEMENTED AT THE FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL LEVELS. WE WANT TO FIND OUT WHAT HAS WORKED AND WHAT HAS NOT. WE WANT TO FIND OUT WHAT ADDITIONAL EFFORTS THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION IS PLANNING TO CARRY OUT ITS LEADERSHIP RESPONSIBILITIES FOR DRUG EDUCATION. AND WE WANT TO KNOW WHAT MORE CONGRESS AND THE DEPARTMENT NEED TO DO TO ASSURE STRONG FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR DRUG EDUCATION.

PRESIDENT BUSH HAS SAID HE WANTS TO BE REMEMBERED AS THE EDUCATION PRESIDENT. THIS COMMITTEE IS READY TO HELP HIM AS MUCH AS WE CAN, AT LEAST AS FAR AS DRUG EDUCATION IS CONCERNED. WE LOOK FORWARD TO RECEIVING THE ANTI-DRUG PROPOSALS OF HIS EDUCATION SECRETARY.

BEFORE HEARING FROM DR. CAVAZOS, I YIELD TO OTHER MEMBERS WHO WISH TO MAKE OPENING REMARKS.

CONGRESSMAN LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

VICE-CHAIRMAN HOUSE SELECT NARCOTICS COMMITTEE

HEARING ON NATIONAL CRISIS IN DRUG ABUSE TREATMENT

JULY 25, 1989

THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. I AM PLEASED TO JOIN YOU IN WELCOMING OUR WITNESSES TO TODAY'S TREATMENT HEARING AND I LOOK FORWARD TO THEIR TESTIMONY.

I BELIEVE THAT THE BEST HOPE IN COMBATTING DRUGS IS TO REDUCE DEMAND THROUGH EDUCATION. WE MUST TEACH OUR YOUTH THAT USING DRUGS IS A RISK NEVER WORTH TAKING. WE MUST GET TO THEM BEFORE THEY HAVE TRIED DRUGS, BEFORE THEY HAVE BECOME ADDICTED.

NONETHELESS, WE MUST NOT FORGET ABOUT THOSE WHO HAVE ALREADY MADE THAT MISTAKE AND HAVE BECOME ADDICTED TO DANGEROUS ILLEGAL DRUGS. THEIR PLIGHT IS A TRAGEDY FOR THEMSELVES AND THEIR FAMILIES. THEY DESERVE A SECOND CHANCE. THOSE WHO HAVE THE WILL TO FIGHT THEIR ADDICTION MUST RECEIVE THE TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION THEY REQUIRE.

HOWEVER, WHAT CONCERNS ME GREATLY IS THAT WE STILL ARE NOT SURE WHAT WORKS IN TREATING ADDICTS OF MANY DRUGS, INCLUDING CRACK COCAINE. WE WILL BE LOOKING TO TODAY'S WITNESSES TO GIVE US GUIDANCE IN THIS AREA, AND PERHAPS TO RECOMMEND WHERE MORE RESEARCH IS NEEDED.

I LOOK FORWARD TO TODAY'S DISCUSSION. THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.

OPENING STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES H. SCHEUER
BEFORE THE SELECT COMMITTEE OF NARCOTICS, ABUSE AND CONTROL
EDUCATING AMERICA'S YOUTH AGAINST DRUGS:
THE FEDERAL DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION STRATEGY

JULY 26, 1989

Mr. Secretary:

Chairman Rangel, and the ranking minority member, Mr. Coughlin, have invited you to testify today because your department is vital to drug prevention and education efforts in our nation's schools.

A broad range of drug abuse experts, including many law enforcement officials, agree that the best long-range hope for overcoming America's drug problem lies in effective drug abuse education and prevention.

Witnesses testifying before the Select Committee in the past have called for a comprehensive national drug abuse education and prevention strategy aimed at changing public attitudes about drugs, discouraging drug use and giving people the skills to resist pressures to use drugs. We will not be successful in these efforts until we successfully enlist the support of parents, our schools, communities, clergy, media, employers and the private sector.

Mr. Secretary, the 1988 high school senior survey on drug abuse brought good news to middle America. It showed an increasing perception among high school seniors of the risks associated with cocaine use and a five percent decline in cocaine use in the same group.

The statistics that are used, however, do not survey high school dropouts--a destitute subgroup who are likely to be our most serious drug abusers. In New York, almost one-third of the high school age population drops out of school. In effect, there is a drug crisis which we see on the streets but not in our national statistics.

Mr. Secretary, I would like to hear from you and the other witnesses about whether we are making a difference, particularly in our inner cities, with our drug education efforts. As you know, many of our nation's urban areas are being threatened by a confluence of severe problems. I would like to ascertain your views on whether drug education can really make a difference in the absence of substantially more investment in our urban schools, in early childhood education, more housing for our homeless and more opportunity, such as vastly expanded job training.

I believe drug education does make a difference. It is apparent, however, that we are not spending

enough in this area. The President has asked for $25 million for set asides for one-time urban emergency grants to urban school systems with the worst drug problems. Unfortunately, this is not enough to make a serious dent in drug abuse. While the intent and rhetoric from the Administration and Congress has been supportive, I am concerned that we are not devoting the resources needed to really make a difference.

Mr. Cavazos, your office has told us that the Department of Education will turn its attention to the impact of alcohol and drug education programs in inner cities. I hope that you will ask the tough questions about the successes and failures of our programs. This is a priority.

I would like to commend you, Mr. Secretary, for two initiatives which will have an impact in our inner cities. The first project is a comprehensive drug prevention handbook for parents--which I assume you will send to all parents. The second effort is a new videotape that will focus on the linkage between drug use and school dropouts. I understand that it will be designed to address the special needs of inner city youth and will be available in both Spanish and English.

I look forward to hearing your testimony as well as the testimony from the other witnesses.

# # #

TESTIMONY BEFORE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

BY

HONORABLE LAURO F. CAVAZOS
SECRETARY OF EDUCATION

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 1989

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, thank you for this opportunity to discuss the Department of Education's role in implementing drug use prevention and education activities. The prevention of illegal drug use is aimed at reaching into every community, every family, every school, and every workplace: to bring an awareness of the drug problem to everyone and to motivate each individual to participate in the fight against drugs. Prevention, therefore, includes encouraging non-users to remain drug-free and motivating current users to stop drug use. We encourage development of creative responses, especially at the local level, to meet each community's needs and resources, while national initiatives are geared to raising awareness of illegal drug use, mobilizing citizen action, and creating an environment in which illegal drug use is unacceptable.

States and local communities play a critical role in developing and implementing drug use prevention programs. We, at the Department, support this role in three ways: by providing leadership, by disseminating information, and by providing technical and financial assistance. This support constitutes the cornerstone of the Department's programs in drug use prevention and education.

Leadership

The Department has provided aggressive leadership in drug use prevention since 1986. The Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1986 was implemented quickly and efficiently. We proposed technical amendments to increase the accountability of States in expending funds appropriated under this Act and by working with the Congress were successful in getting several of these amendments passed. The

Department's handbook Schools Without Drugs was issued originally in August of 1986. The handbook included an outline of a 12-point plan for achieving drug-free schools. Our experience continues to show that the principal recommendation in Schools Without Drugs--to bring together parents, teachers, administrators, students, and other members of the community to formulate and implement comprehensive prevention programs--has the best chance of success in getting drugs out of schools and communities. Also, we continue to believe that there must be strong anti-drug policies in the schools and that these policies must be enforced.

Taking into account what we have learned over the past several years, we are now focusing our activities at the Department to apply this knowledge--particularly in regard to the involvement of parents and law enforcement officials and the importance of educating our children early about the dangers of drugs. Consequently, we are emphasizing the crucial role of parents in instilling the right standards and values. They need to be knowledgeable about drugs and impart a clear message that drug use is wrong and harmful.. We also stress the necessity of involving law enforcement officials in developing programs at the local level and of beginning prevention efforts at an early age. We continue to emphasize that all materials for use in schools must contain a strong message that drug use is wrong and harmful. Since current data indicate that alcohol is the drug of choice, we believe increasing emphasis must be placed on providing accurate and up-to-date information on its effects. In fact, the Department has just issued a revised edition of Schools Without Drugs that includes this information.

As part of our leadership role, we must raise the public's awareness by discussing drug use prevention in speeches across the country. As you may recall, at my first press conference as Secretary of Education, I announced the distribution of eight drug prevention videotapes to every school system in the Nation. Since then, I have spoken frequently to educators, parents, and students about the dangers of drugs.

At the Federal level, we have continued in the forefront of efforts to coordinate "demand reduction" activities by initiating and supporting many joint efforts with other agencies and departments. One example is our support of the Surgeon General's Workshop on Drunk Driving. I commented on the Surgeon General's report when I testified before the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee last month. Within the Department, I have staff in my immediate office working to implement and coordinate the Department's overall drug prevention efforts. We hold monthly meetings of the Prevention Education Committee. This Committee consists of members from Federal agencies that have responsibilities in the area of alcohol and drug use prevention for youth. We are also working closely with staff at the Office of National Drug Control Policy and are looking forward to working with Director Bennett to implement the national strategy that will be announced on September 5th.

Another major component of our leadership is collecting information and creating products to fill gaps in the information available. For example, within the past year, we have emphasized the importance of

evaluating programs funded with Federal dollars, and studying how the States have implemented and administered the Anti-Drug Abuse Acts of 1986 and 1988. Also, we plan to commission a survey of college students to obtain more reliable information about their use of illegal substances on the Nation's campuses.

We have also been working on creating products that we believe will provide helpful and relevant information to everyone who wants to work to prevent drug use. For example, in October 1988 we issued a guide to help educators select effective prevention curricula. As I reported to you and the members of this Committee on June 6th, in January 1990 we will be issuing a model drug use prevention and education curriculum that will focus on what students should know about alcohol and other drugs and what strategies help to avoid use of these substances.

We are also developing a drug use prevention handbook for parents. This handbook will bring together the best available information on protecting youngsters from the threat of drugs. We will examine how children learn, how basic values protect children from irresponsible actions, how to help children resist peer pressures to try drugs, and how strong parents serve as effective role models. The handbook will include information to help parents know how to talk to their children about drugs, and more importantly, when.

In addition to my public statements about the importance of prevention and education, I have asked my staff to prepare video public service announcements in both English and Spanish, in which I will appear personally, warning about the dangers of drug use. We will also develop a new videotape that will focus on the linkage between drug use and dropping out of school. The program will be designed to address the special needs of inner-city youth, and it will be available in both English and Spanish to ensure the widest possible use.

Increased knowledge has permitted us to fine-tune priorities within our existing discretionary grant programs. For example, we have targeted resources in one of these programs to activities for children in grades K-8 since research has shown drug use prevention must begin early. In addition, there are requirements for evaluation included in each of our discretionary programs. Individuals at the local level must look at the successes and failures of their projects to see where improvements can be made.

The President and I have also proposed a major initiative for FY 1990 that would provide $25 million for urban emergency grants to assist a number of city school systems with the worst drug problems. We believe that these additional resources will help solve the critical problems of our urban schools.

Dissemination of Information

In addition to the leadership activities I have just described, the Department's support for efforts at the State and local level includes the dissemination of information. I have already mentioned our extensive distribution of the videotapes. We continue to distribute thousands of copies of the Drug Prevention Curricula Guide and the revised edition of Schools without Drugs. Almost 350,000 copies of the Challenge Newsletter are distributed every other month to parent groups, superintendents, and principals across the country. This Newsletter contains information about programs that work, tips for parents and teachers, and other information about new developments in drug use prevention. In several joint projects with other agencies, we have assisted in disseminating information. For example, we are working with USIA to translate the videotapes into Spanish; we have distributed all our materials to both the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Department of Defense Dependents' Schools; and we have been working with the National Association for Children of Alcoholics to distribute their new guide, It's Elementary, to elementary schools across the Nation.

We just concluded the second year of the Drug-Free School Recognition Program by honoring 47 schools at the White House for their progress in becoming drug-free. Abstracts of each of these programs are being prepared now and will be widely disseminated in the fall. This will be an important part of our continuing effort to respond to the large number of requests we receive for information about effective prevention programs.

We are working with the staff of HHS' National Clearinghouse for Alcohol and Drug Information to prepare a listing of drug prevention curricula being used by school districts throughout the Nation. Curricula included on the list will have been assessed to ensure that they contain up-to-date information, are age-appropriate, and have a strong message that drug use is wrong and harmful. This listing should be available for dissemination to the public this fall.

Technical and Financial Assistance

Finally, the Department provides technical and financial assistance to States and localities to ensure that their efforts are effectively designed, initiated, and sustained. The major source of financial assistance is the State and local formula grant program with which I am sure you and the members of the Committee are familiar. More than 91% of funds available under the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act are distributed to the States based on school-aged enrollment. I have attached, for the record, the most current information on the expenditures of these funds, as reported by the States, for fiscal years 1987 and 1988. The FY 1989 funds became available for obligation on July 1st, and we are now in the process of awarding FY 1989 funds to the States.

Another important element of the financial and technical assistance we provide is our support of the five Regional Centers for Drug-Free Schools and Communities. They were established to provide training to school teams; provide technical assistance to State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and institutions of higher education; and evaluate and disseminate information on effective drug and alcohol abuse education

and prevention programs and strategies. At our direction, the Regional Centers will be sponsoring a series of regional conferences this fall to bring teachers, administrators, parents, and others together to discuss issues on drug use prevention in their regions. Schools honored by the Drug-Free Schools Recognition Program in each region will also be making special presentations about their programs.

In conjunction with the Department of Health and Human Services and the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration, we are sponsoring a series of regional training workshops for college administrators and counselors. These workshops assist colleges and universities in learning how to implement standards for achieving drug-free campuses. These standards were developed by the Network of Drug-Free Colleges, which was started and funded by the Department of Education. As a former college president, I am particularly pleased to report that over one-third of the nation's colleges have joined this Network, and the number continues to grow.

Ten percent of the nation's colleges and universities have received institutional grants under our Discretionary program for campus-based drug prevention programs. Next year we will put together information on the most successful of these programs to assist other colleges and universities in establishing their own programs.

The Fourth Annual Conference on Drug-Free Schools will be held in the spring of 1990. This conference will bring together the individuals responsible for implementing the State and local programs in each State. Representatives from both the Governors' offices and from the

State educational agencies will attend. This annual conference is an opportunity for Department staff to provide technical assistance in implementing the requirements of the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, to share examples of exemplary programs, and to distribute information on a wide variety of issues related to drug use prevention.

Mr. Chairman, I know you and the members of the Committee are familiar with some of the Department's programs that I have mentioned today, so I have been brief and cited only selected examples. I have concentrated my remarks on the initiatives that we have begun over the last year and our plans for new activities.

As I mentioned at the outset, the Department's programs are on track, and our new activities reflect the current research in the area of drug use prevention. We will continue to fulfill our role by providing leadership, which includes collecting information; disseminating information; and providing technical and financial assistance. The Office of Drug use prevention will remain a top priority in the Department. The coordination of efforts at the federal level is critical, and we will work very closely with Director Bennett and the Office of National Drug Control Policy to implement the national strategy when it is released.

Finally, each of us must realize that we have a role to play in the war against drugs. We must each take responsibility in our State and local efforts to achieve not only schools without drugs, but communities without drugs and, finally, a drug-free society.

I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

- 9 -

DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS EXPENDITURES

All fiscal year 1987 and fiscal year 1988 funds appropriated for Drug-Free Schools and Communities State grants have been obligated. The latest information available to the Department on the expenditure of these funds is from the last reporting period, which ended June 30, 1989, and covered expenditures as of March 31, 1989. According to these reports, $125,403,542 of the $161,046,000 first-year appropriation for Drug-Free Schools State grants (77.9 percent) had been expended. We expect that most of the remaining first-year funds have been spent since then, which should be reflected in future expenditure reports. Of the $191,480,000 second-year funds for the program, $66,308,009 (34.6 percent) were reported as spent as of March 31. Fiscal year 1989 funds are now in the process of being awarded to the States.

Reported expenditure data for the individual States for the 1987 and 1988 appropriations are as follows:

Drug Free Schools State Grants Year 1 of the program (FY/81002)

STATE	GOVERNOR DATA AWARD AMT	GOVERNOR DATA EXPENDITURES THRU 3/31/89	SEA DATA AWARD AMT	SEA DATA EXPENDITURES THRU 3/31/89	STATE AWARD TOTAL	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THRU 3/31/89
ALABAMA	828,271	257,619	1,932,633	1,419,391	2,760,904	1,677,010
ALASKA	238,651	209,689	556,854	477,987	795,505	687,676
ARIZONA	695,432	695,432	1,612,674	1,459,954	2,308,106	2,155,385
ARKANSAS	483,328	483,328	1,127,765	1,048,169	1,611,093	1,529,497
CALIFORNIA	4,679,651	2,228,980	10,919,137	10,338,422	15,598,788	12,565,411
COLORADO	602,379	602,379	1,405,551	1,370,863	2,007,930	1,973,242
CONNECTICUT	561,678	503,796	1,310,581	1,205,508	1,872,259	1,709,305
DELAWARE	238,651	238,651	556,854	549,781	795,505	788,432
DIST. OF COL.	238,651	107,800	556,854	407,402	795,505	515,202
FLORIDA	1,822,401	(1,305,266)	4,252,266	3,868,425	6,074,667	5,868,425
GEORGIA	1,209,846	1,114,744	2,822,973	(2,470,732)	4,032,819	1,114,744
HAWAII	238,651	(60,412)	556,854	476,692	795,505	476,692
IDAHO	238,651	238,651	556,854	444,870	795,505	683,521
ILLINOIS	751,000	751,000	1,239,202	1,105,062	1,990,202	1,856,062
INDIANA	1,122,338	938,817	2,618,789	2,570,738	3,741,127	3,509,523
IOWA	572,871	572,871	1,336,698	1,272,165	1,909,569	1,845,036
KANSAS	460,942	460,942	1,075,532	538,914	1,536,474	999,856
KENTUCKY	766,202	766,202	1,787,804	1,741,197	2,554,006	2,507,399
LOUISIANA	967,675	689,524	2,257,904	1,968,515	3,225,577	2,656,039
MAINE	238,651	99,584	556,854	533,796	795,505	620,380
MARYLAND	767,765	767,765	1,791,436	1,368,195	2,559,201	2,145,960
MASSACHUSETTS	1,020,585	1,020,585	2,381,366	2,381,366	3,401,949	3,401,949
MICHIGAN	1,853,965	1,853,965	4,325,867	3,961,678	6,179,832	5,815,643
MINNESOTA	806,803	672,737	1,882,775	1,363,241	2,689,577	2,035,967
MISSISSIPPI	586,099	501,923	1,367,563	1,311,991	1,953,662	1,813,911
MISSOURI	955,681	557,746	2,231,188	2,214,668	3,186,868	2,771,414
MONTANA	238,651	221,491	556,854	545,453	795,505	766,944
NEBRASKA	376,000	245,295	768,786	313,019	1,058,234	621,524
NEVADA	238,651	238,651	556,854	492,017	795,505	730,668
NEW HAMPSHIRE	238,651	198,496	556,854	438,009	795,505	636,504
NEW JERSEY	1,391,984	1,389,861	3,247,963	3,125,447	4,639,947	4,515,308
NEW MEXICO	327,295	176,863	717,321	661,760	1,044,616	838,623
NEW YORK	3,261,359	(1,438,396)	7,611,839	1,013,387	10,874,028	1,013,387
NORTH CAROLINA	1,256,758	1,143,431	2,811,103	2,460,544	4,115,861	3,603,975
NORTH DAKOTA	238,651	161,265	556,854	556,854	795,505	718,119
OHIO	2,127,861	1,470,176	4,964,530	4,748,188	7,092,200	6,224,213
OKLAHOMA	651,220	651,220	1,519,515	1,399,244	2,170,735	2,047,464
OREGON	572,836	572,836	1,336,618	1,140,541	1,909,454	1,662,750
PENNSYLVANIA	2,169,380	1,161,253	5,061,882	4,849,054	7,231,262	5,996,307
RHODE ISLAND	238,651	238,651	556,854	480,230	795,505	718,881
SOUTH CAROLINA	686,736	686,736	1,602,674	1,595,171	2,289,448	2,282,005
SOUTH DAKOTA	238,651	182,510	556,854	556,854	795,505	739,364
TENNESSEE	952,059	952,059	2,174,806	1,820,224	3,126,865	2,772,514
TEXAS	7,333,437	7,333,437	3,778,115	3,742,782	11,111,552	9,076,199
UTAH	420,368	375,336	864,867	864,369	1,421,153	1,227,705
VERMONT	238,651	238,358	556,854	103,057	795,505	269,595
VIRGINIA	1,055,181	521,662	2,462,589	2,358,796	3,517,270	2,880,248
WASHINGTON	829,289	490,758	1,935,007	1,832,576	2,764,296	2,329,134
WEST VIRGINIA	411,975	183,865	957,826	861,807	1,369,751	1,045,671

Drug Free Schools State Grants Year 1 of the program (FY7/81000)

STATE	ADVANCE DATA AWARD AMT	ADVANCE DATA EXPENDITURES THRU 3/31/89	SEA DATA AWARD AMT	SEA DATA EXPENDITURES THRU 3/31/89	STATE AWARD TOTAL	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THRU 3/31/89
[illegible]	935,112	718,487	2,187,928	1,330,387	3,117,040	2,048,874
[illegible]	238,657	(129,329)	556,854	492,592	795,511	492,395
AMERICAN SAMOA	76,600	74,750	178,921	114,159	255,607	188,947
NEW MARIANAS	38,521	27,878	89,882	80,109	128,403	107,987
GUAM	214,934	0	536,179	98,413	751,113	98,413
PUERTO RICO	869,781	776,537	2,090,157	2,065,525	2,959,938	2,842,062
PALAU	31,021	14,865	72,352	47,578	103,403	62,227
VIRGIN ISLANDS	220,344	78,605	514,136	106,633	734,480	185,238
Dept Pub Instr, AS	65,470	65,470				
Dept Police, TT	1,495,660	1,352,001				
	$8,313,860	$3,987,568	$12,752,200	$9,415,974	$17,340,300	$13,403,542

NOTE: Bracketed figures were reported to Washington and are not reflected in the March 31, 1989 expenditure reports.

Drug Free Schools State Grants Year 2 of the program (FY95/SY95)

STATE	Governor Data: AWARD AMT	Governor Data: EXPENDITURES THRU 12/31/95	SEA Data: AWARD AMT	SEA Data: EXPENDITURES THRU 12/31/95	STATE AWARD TOTAL	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THRU 12/31/95	STATE
ALABAMA	993,221	0	2,284,192	606,593	3,277,413	606,593	ALABAMA
ALASKA	283,773	34,839	662,138	221,779	945,911	256,618	ALASKA
ARIZONA	729,675	82,761	1,703,042	1,433,256	2,432,717	1,516,017	ARIZONA
ARKANSAS	569,423	297,219	1,328,634	1,161,415	1,898,057	1,458,634	ARKANSAS
CALIFORNIA	5,736,457	0	13,385,066	12,300,628	19,121,523	12,300,628	CALIFORNIA
COLORADO	716,605	166,283	1,672,077	1,459,121	2,388,682	1,625,404	COLORADO
CONNECTICUT	668,345	12,737	1,559,480	819,672	2,227,825	832,409	CONNECTICUT
DELAWARE	283,773	43,334	662,138	552,651	945,911	595,985	DELAWARE
DIST. OF COL.	283,773	44,793	662,138	127,936	945,911	172,729	DIST. OF COL.
FLORIDA	2,173,842	0	5,070,531	0	7,244,373	0	FLORIDA
GEORGIA	1,476,660	356,498	3,445,485	1,532,515	4,922,145	1,889,013	GEORGIA
HAWAII	283,773	176,720	662,138	130,747	945,911	326,747	HAWAII
IDAHO	283,773	52,278	662,138	0	945,911	52,278	IDAHO
ILLINOIS	917,447	719,658	6,170,558	4,801,218	8,814,799	6,521,535	ILLINOIS
INDIANA	1,318,601	198,254	3,076,735	2,252,784	4,395,336	2,450,903	INDIANA
IOWA	665,955	331,801	1,553,890	1,362,445	2,219,785	1,694,246	IOWA
KANSAS	544,089	0	1,269,540	0	1,813,629	0	KANSAS
KENTUCKY	934,504	668,670	2,111,219	43,352	3,016,173	712,022	KENTUCKY
LOUISIANA	1,134,021	339,836	2,646,049	1,070,343	3,780,069	1,410,179	LOUISIANA
MAINE	283,773	73,156	662,138	406,406	945,911	479,562	MAINE
MARYLAND	954,286	372,859	2,226,622	194,435	3,180,888	567,294	MARYLAND
MASSACHUSETTS	1,179,564	125,330	2,753,016	2,118,476	3,932,580	2,244,776	MASSACHUSETTS
MICHIGAN	2,202,895	0	5,140,090	2,537,249	7,342,985	2,537,249	MICHIGAN
MINNESOTA	950,647	18,717	2,218,177	470,818	3,168,824	537,535	MINNESOTA
MISSISSIPPI	702,125	243,858	1,638,292	1,064,297	2,340,417	1,308,155	MISSISSIPPI
MISSOURI	1,179,195	12,156	2,634,789	675,781	3,763,984	687,941	MISSOURI
MONTANA	283,773	144,258	662,138	536,813	945,911	681,071	MONTANA
NEBRASKA	282,071	0	852,925	0	1,218,469	5,363	NEBRASKA
NEVADA	283,773	88,128	662,138	159,300	945,911	247,428	NEVADA
NEW HAMPSHIRE	283,773	0	662,138	1,426	945,911	1,426	NEW HAMPSHIRE
NEW JERSEY	1,625,328	0	3,791,731	3,208,050	5,416,759	3,208,050	NEW JERSEY
NEW MEXICO	366,747	68,721	855,743	317,894	1,222,490	386,615	NEW MEXICO
NEW YORK	5,841,105	0	8,962,754	742,374	12,803,979	742,374	NEW YORK
NORTH CAROLINA	1,438,235	0	3,355,414	90,702	4,793,649	90,702	NORTH CAROLINA
NORTH DAKOTA	283,773	0	662,138	117,443	945,911	117,443	NORTH DAKOTA
OHIO	2,526,213	950,231	5,894,494	4,097,143	8,420,707	5,085,474	OHIO
OKLAHOMA	757,602	215,405	1,767,786	714,457	2,525,438	929,862	OKLAHOMA
OREGON	598,377	461,004	1,396,213	550,087	1,994,590	1,069,091	OREGON
PENNSYLVANIA	2,529,832	0	5,902,939	2,582,961	8,432,771	2,582,961	PENNSYLVANIA
RHODE ISLAND	283,773	114,000	662,138	0	945,911	114,000	RHODE ISLAND
SOUTH CAROLINA	816,756	261,975	1,905,718	195,498	2,722,474	457,473	SOUTH CAROLINA
SOUTH DAKOTA	283,773	0	662,138	595,300	945,911	595,300	SOUTH DAKOTA
TENNESSEE	1,112,305	0	2,595,380	1,181,907	3,707,685	1,181,907	TENNESSEE
TEXAS	4,855,522	1,758,470	8,458,215	978,569	13,511,737	2,737,039	TEXAS
UTAH	536,690	54,456	1,182,277	216,663	1,688,967	271,111	UTAH
VERMONT	283,773	0	662,138	17,074	945,911	17,074	VERMONT
VIRGINIA	1,241,391	0	2,896,579	413,135	4,137,969	413,135	VIRGINIA
WASHINGTON	950,807	10,351	2,218,551	0	3,169,358	10,351	WASHINGTON
WEST VIRGINIA	468,085	0	1,092,199	524,325	1,560,284	524,325	WEST VIRGINIA
WISCONSIN	1,156,275	67,917	2,581,303	0	3,687,578	67,917	WISCONSIN

Entitlements Schools State Grants Year 2 of the program (FY8/9100)

STATE	[illegible] DATA		SEA DATA			TOTAL
	AVERAGE ADA	ENTITLEMENTS FOR FY 15/31/89	AVERAGE ADA	ENTITLEMENTS FOR FY 15/31/89	STATE AVERAGE TOTAL	ENTITLEMENTS FOR FY 15/31/89
[illegible]	283,775	0	342,138	221,131	965,911	221,131 [illegible]
[illegible]	41,150	27,428	211,371	10,619	501,959	48,047 [illegible]
[illegible]	45,507	0	106,184	963	151,691	963 [illegible]
[illegible]	256,179	0	147,983	0	854,262	0 [illegible]
PUERTO RICO	1,062,055	4,762	2,478,128	1,855,672	5,541,183	1,860,435 PUERTO RICO
[illegible]	36,847	0	85,510	0	122,157	0 [illegible]
VIRGIN ISLANDS	260,307	0	607,384	10,769	867,691	10,769 VIRGIN ISLANDS
Dept Pub Instr, NC	63,471	8,363				
Dept Police, [illegible]	1,727,000	1,293,659				
	57,xxx,000	12,379,938	134,334,000	55,929,371	191,480,330	68,358,359

July 26, 1989

Testimony

by

Laurey Stryker
Assistant Commissioner
Florida Department of Education

before the

Select Committee on Narcotics
and Abuse Control

ON BEHALF OF COMMISSIONER BETTY CASTOR AND THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, I WANT TO THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN, FOR GRANTING US THIS OPPORTUNITY TO SHARE OUR STATE'S DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES PROGRAM WITH THE MEMBERS OF THIS COMMITTEE.

I WILL BEGIN BY SAYING THAT WE ARE NOT DOING ENOUGH TO COMBAT THIS PROBLEM - AT THE FEDERAL, STATE OR LOCAL LEVEL. THERE ARE SO MANY FACTORS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO THE PROBLEM AND LEAD PEOPLE TO A LIFE OF DRUG ADDICTION THAT WE CAN PROBABLY NEVER ADEQUATELY ADDRESS ALL OF THEM.

FLORIDA HAS A UNIQUE CHALLENGE IN EDUCATING OUR CITIZENS ABOUT THE OVERWHELMING DANGERS ASSOCIATED WITH THE USE AND ABUSE OF ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUGS. WITH OVER 1,350 MILES OF COASTLINE AND NUMEROUS PORTS, THE IMPORTATION OF ILLEGAL DRUGS IS EASILY ACCOMPLISHED. FLORIDA EXPERIENCES HIGH LEVELS OF TRANSIENT POPULATION INFLUXES OF MIGRANTS AND TOURISTS. WE ALSO ABSORB AN ADDITIONAL 800 TO 1,000 NEW RESIDENTS EVERY DAY, AND THIS FALL WE ARE EXPECTING AN ADDITIONAL 80,000 STUDENTS IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS. ALL OF THESE FACTORS EXERT A TREMOUS STRAIN ON OUR RESOURCES AND MAKE IT MORE DIFFICULT TO MEET ALL OUR CRITICAL NEEDS. AN INITIAL RESPONSE OF THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE, IN 1986, WAS TO MANDATE DRUG EDUCATION IN GRADES K-12.

BECAUSE OF HER DESIRE TO ADDRESS CHILDREN'S HEALTH ISSUES IN A COMPREHENSIVE WAY, COMMISSIONER CASTOR OPENED THE PREVENTION CENTER WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. FLORIDA ADMINISTERS THE FEDERAL DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES PROGRAM THROUGH THE PREVENTION CENTER.

WHILE THE PREVENTION CENTER DOES PROVIDE LEADERSHIP AND GUIDANCE, FLORIDA IS A "LOCAL RULE" STATE AND DECISIONS ON HOW TO IMPLEMENT

DRUG EDUCATION ARE MADE AT THE LOCAL LEVEL. AS IN OTHER STATES, WE HAVE VERY DIVERSE COMMUNITIES. COMMUNITY MEMBERS ARE IN THE BEST POSITION TO ASSESS NEEDS AND IMPLEMENT PROGRAMS. WITHOUT LOCAL COMMITMENT AND OWNERSHIP, PREVENTION PROGRAMS CANNOT SUCCEED. IT TAKES LOCAL PARENT GROUPS, LAW ENFORCEMENT, TEACHERS, CHURCHES, AND COMMUNITY MINDED PEOPLE TO REMOVE DRUGS FROM A COMMUNITY.

FLORIDA'S LOCAL DISTRICTS DEVELOP THEIR OWN PLANS WITH ASSISTANCE FROM THE PREVENTION CENTER AND GUIDANCE FROM THEIR LOCAL ADVISORY COUNCILS. BUILT INTO THE DISTRICT PLANS ARE COMPONENTS ADDRESSING:

- A DRUG USE POLICY
- THE ROLE OF THEIR ADVISORY COUNCIL
- STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING
- K-12 CURRICULUM
- PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT
- PROGRAM EVALUATION
- AND OTHER INFORMATION NEEDED BY THE PREVENTION CENTER TO ASSURE COMPLIANCE WITH THE FEDERAL GUIDELINES.

NINETY PERCENT OF THE FEDERAL DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS DOLLARS FLOW DIRECTLY THROUGH TO THE LOCAL LEVEL. MANY OF THESE FUNDS ARE USED TO DEVELOP OR PURCHASE CURRICULUM AND PROVIDE INSERVICE TRAINING TO TEACHERS AND COUNSELORS. THE REMAINING TEN PERCENT IS USED TO DIRECT FLORIDA'S PROGRAM FROM THE PREVENTION CENTER. DECISIONS ON HOW TO ALLOCATE THE FEDERAL DOLLARS TO THE DISTRICTS ARE BASED ON FLORIDA'S FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT (FTE) FUNDING FORMULA WHICH ENSURES AN EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS TO URBAN, RURAL AND MID-SIZED DISTRICT. THE MINIMUM DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS ALLOCATION PER DISTRICT IS $8,000.

PREVENTION IS A NEW AREA AND RESEARCH CONTINUES EACH YEAR ON WHAT IS REALLY WORKING. SOME SPECIFIC PROGRAMS HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED AS BEING EFFECTIVE IN REDUCING DRUG PROBLEMS WITH SCHOOL AGE YOUTH. TWO OF THE MOST PROMISING PROGRAM STRATEGIES INVOLVE POSITIVE ADULT AND/OR STUDENT ROLE MODELS WORKING WITH STUDENTS WHO NEED ASSISTANCE (SUCH AS STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS OR PEER COUNSELING) AND INITIATIVES THAT INVOLVE THE TOTAL COMMUNITY WORKING TOGETHER TO COMBAT DRUG PROBLEMS. IN FLORIDA, WE ARE COMMITTED TO PROVIDING THE MOST EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS THAT WILL HELP US WIN THE WAR.

MANY OF OUR 67 SCHOOL DISTRICTS ARE CURRENTLY IMPLEMENTING STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS/PEER COUNSELING PROGRAMS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS. CORE TEAMS, CARE TEAMS, PEER HELPERS, AND PEER FACILITATORS ARE ALL PROGRAMS THAT IDENTIFY, COUNSEL AND REFER STUDENTS WHO HAVE DRUG PROBLEMS. ONE OF OUR SCHOOLS IN DADE COUNTY WHICH IMPLEMENTS THE DISTRICTWIDE "PROJECT TRUST" STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, W. R. THOMAS JUNIOR HIGH, HAS BEEN RECOGNIZED BY THE NATIONAL DRUG-FREE SCHOOL RECOGNITION PROGRAM. IT TRULY IS A DRUG-FREE SCHOOL. THE BROWARD COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT'S PEER COUNSELING PROGRAM HAS BEEN A NATIONAL LEADER FOR MANY OTHER SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN DEVELOPING SIMILAR PROGRAMS.

THE DEPARTMENT IS COMMITTED TO IDENTIFYING AND PROMOTING EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS THAT WORK. THROUGH OUR "PRINCIPAL PREVENTION CONSULTANT" PROGRAM, THE PRINCIPAL OF W. R. THOMAS WILL ASSIST THE PREVENTION CENTER ON A HALF TIME BASIS IN HELPING OTHER SCHOOLS DEVELOP A "DRUG-FREE" SCHOOLS PROGRAM. THROUGH OUR "SHARING SUCCESS IN FLORIDA PROGRAM" INFORMATION ABOUT EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS IS DISSEMINATED STATEWIDE. IN OCTOBER, A TELECONFERENCE WILL FEATURE THESE EXEMPLARY EFFORTS AND PREVENTION CENTER STAFF WILL BE ABLE TO PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

TO OTHER SCHOOLS. RECOGNIZING THE EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPORTANCE FOR COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT, THE PREVENTION CENTER REQUIRES ALL DISTRICTS TO PROMOTE THE ACTIVE COORDINATION OF COMMUNITY AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS, BUSINESSES AND PARENTS. IN EACH DISTRICT, THE COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH EDUCATION/DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS ADVISORY COUNCIL INCLUDES REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE COMMUNITY. COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS PRESENTLY EXIST WITH MANY OF OUR SCHOOLS, ESPECIALLY IN THE PLANNING AND SPONSORING OF ALTERNATIVE EVENTS SUCH AS PROJECT GRADUATION, JUST SAY NO CLUBS AND RED RIBBON DRUG AWARENESS WEEK.

THE IMPACT OF THE FEDERAL ACT ON DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION AND PREVENTION IS SUBSTANTIAL IN BOTH ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS. LOCAL ADMINISTRATORS MUST NOW INDICATE HOW MUCH TIME IS DEDICATED TO DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION IN THEIR PUPIL PROGRESSION PLANS. EDUCATORS ARE RECEIVING INSERVICE TRAINING ON HOW TO TEACH DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION. STUDENTS ARE RECEIVING MORE HOURS OF INSTRUCTION ON HOW TO PREVENT DRUG ABUSE. IN ADDITION, THE UTILIZATION OF LOCAL AND STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS IS INVOLVING A WIDE RANGE OF COMMUNITY LEADERS IN DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION.

IT IS DIFFICULT TO MEASURE THE IMPACT OF THE FEDERAL ACT BUT WE ARE WORKING WITH SCHOOLS TO HELP EVALUATE THEIR SPECIFIC PROGRAMS. TO HELP ASSESS THE IMPACT, THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ADMINISTERED A SURVEY ENTITLED "STUDENTS AND DRUGS" IN 1988. THIS SURVEY WAS DESIGNED TO MEASURE ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG USE AMONG FLORIDA'S SECONDARY STUDENTS AND PROVIDE THE BASELINE DATA NEEDED TO MAKE ACCURATE IMPACT ASSESSMENTS OF THE DRUG FREE SCHOOLS PROGRAMS. THE RESULTS OF THE SURVEY ALSO PROVIDED GUIDANCE AND DIRECTION FOR IMPLEMENTING OUR PROGRAMS.

THE SURVEY INDICATED THAT ALCOHOL USE IS FLORIDA'S NUMBER

ONE DRUG PROBLEM. THEREFORE, WE ARE EDUCATING OUR STUDENTS THAT ALCOHOL IS A DRUG AND IS NOT TO BE USED. THIS NO USE MESSAGE IS ALSO STRONGLY APPLIED TO OTHER DRUGS. TO PROMOTE THE NO USE MESSAGE, THE PREVENTION CENTER PROVIDES CONSULTATION TO THE DISTRICTS ON IDENTIFYING "READILY AVAILABLE, ACCURATE AND UP-TO-DATE" MATERIALS AND CURRICULUM "WHICH CLEARLY AND CONSISTENTLY TEACH THAT ILLICIT DRUG USE IS WRONG AND HARMFUL". ADDITIONALLY, ALL DISTRICTS ARE REQUIRED TO REPORT WHICH DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION CURRICULUM THEY ARE USING AT EACH GRADE LEVEL. THIS ALLOWS US TO MONITOR AND ENCOURAGE DISTRICTS TO TAKE THE EXTRA STEP TO PROMOTE HEALTHY LIFESTYLE CHOICES TO ALL OF FLORIDA'S YOUTH.

THE FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION HAS ALSO PROVIDED GUIDANCE AND DIRECTION FOR STATE IMPLEMENTATION OF DRUG-FREE PROGRAMS. THE PUBLICATION, "WHAT WORKS: SCHOOLS WITHOUT DRUGS" (1987), PROVIDED NATIONAL LEVEL INPUT ON THE UNDERSTANDING OF CHILDREN AND DRUGS WHILE ENCOURAGING PLANS OF ACTIONS FOR PARENTS, SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES. THE PUBLICATION, "DRUG PREVENTION CURRICULA" (1988), PROVIDED GUIDELINES FOR THE SELECTION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF DRUG EDUCATION CURRICULA. IN 1989, INSTRUCTIONAL VIDEO PROGRAMS WERE ALSO DEVELOPED AND DISSEMINATED FOR DISTRICT-LEVEL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS.

THESE MATERIALS AND GUIDELINES HAVE PROVIDED LEADERSHIP AND SUPPORT TO FLORIDA FOR IMPLEMENTING OUR DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES PROGRAM. WE THINK THE APPROPRIATE FEDERAL ROLE IS TO PROVIDE RESOURCES, INFORMATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT FOR STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMMING. WE CANNOT MANDATE ONE PROGRAM AT THE STATE OR FEDERAL LEVEL AND BE EFFECTIVE.

TO FURTHER ASSIST THE STATES, WE RECOMMEND A COMPREHENSIVE NATIONAL DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION POLICY THAT HAS CLEAR, LONG-TERM

GOALS. QUALITY PROGRAMS SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED AND THEIR PROCEDURES DISSEMINATED WIDELY. WE WOULD ALSO LIKE TO SEE THE POLICY ADDRESS INTERVENTION AND TREATMENT FOR MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS WHILE EXPANDING THE ROLE OF PEER COUNSELING. ADDITIONALLY, THE NATIONAL POLICY SHOULD INCLUDE SPECIAL EFFORTS IN ALCOHOL ABUSE PREVENTION AND RECOGNIZE THAT FAMILY ALCOHOLISM IS A SERIOUS PROBLEM AFFECTING CHILDREN. THE NATIONAL POLICY SHOULD ALSO INCORPORATE THE CRITICAL NEEDS OF CHILDREN WHO LIVE IN HIGH DENSITY AREAS OF POVERTY. THIS POLICY SHOULD BE PART OF A LARGER SOCIAL PROGRAM THAT ADDRESSES THE CONDITIONS OF POVERTY THAT BREED ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG ABUSE THROUGH THE LOSS OF HOPE FOR ALTERNATIVES.

THEREFORE, FLORIDA SUPPORTS THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL FOR AN URBAN GRANT PROGRAM. OUR RESEARCH INDICATES A DESPERATE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL RESOURCES FOR INNER-CITY DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION AND PREVENTION PROGRAMS. THE CHALLENGES OF THE MIAMI METROPOLITAN AREA ARE WELL KNOWN, BUT FLORIDA ALSO FACES SIMILAR CHALLENGES IN THE FORT LAUDERDALE, TAMPA BAY, ORLANDO AND JACKSONVILLE AREAS. THE ADDITIONAL RESOURCES WOULD ENHANCE OUR EFFORTS IN THESE TROUBLED CITIES.

FINALLY, ADDITIONAL RESOURCES FOR EVALUATION FROM THE U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COULD ASSIST IN MEASURING THE SUCCESS OF PROGRAMS. EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS, BASED ON PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION, COULD ALSO INDICATE SUCCESSFUL IMPACT OF PREVENTION STRATEGIES. THESE TYPES OF MEASUREMENTS NEED TO BE PROJECTED IN LONG TERM STUDIES TO ACCURATELY MEASURE CHANGES IN BEHAVIOR AND ATTITUDE IN REGARD TO DRUG USE. SHORT TERM EVALUATIONS DO NOT WORK WELL IN PREVENTION.

ONLY THROUGH JOINT PROGRAMS AND COORDINATION AT ALL LEVELS CAN WE SUCCEED. PROGRAM INITIATIVES FROM THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, OFFICE OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION AND OTHER AGENCIES

SHOULD BE PLANNED TO COMPLEMENT ONE ANOTHER.

WE HAVE ALSO WORKED CLOSELY WITH THE LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS TO IMPLEMENT THE FEDERAL ACT. WE PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, TRAINING, RESOURCE REVIEWS, EXEMPLARY INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL, EVALUATION ACCOUNTABILITY AND STATEWIDE LEADERSHIP. WE HAVE IDENTIFIED A CONTACT IN EVERY DISTRICT, AND FUND 45 OUT OF 67 OF THESE POSITIONS WITH STATE DIRECTED DOLLARS. THIS CLOSE WORKING RELATIONSHIP HAS CREATED A SPIRIT OF COOPERATION AND UNITY BETWEEN THE STATE AND LOCAL DISTRICTS

WORKING CLOSELY WITH THE DISTRICTS EXTENDS TO THE GRANT FUNDING PROCESS. THE PREVENTION CENTER HAS ADVISED THEM OF OTHER GRANT OPPORTUNITIES, STREAMLINED APPLICATION PROCESS AND PROVIDED TRAINING DESIGNED TO ASSIST THE DISTRICTS IN CONSTRUCTING THEIR GRANTS.

COORDINATION WITH LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES HAS ALLOWED FLORIDA TO EFFECTIVELY IMPLEMENT THE FEDERAL ACT. ON OUR STATE LEVEL ADVISORY COUNCIL, WE HAVE APPOINTED REPRESENTATIVES OF FLORIDA'S HEALTH AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES (HRS), THE FLORIDA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, THE PTA, THE FLORIDA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION, THE FLORIDA ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES FROM FLORIDA'S COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITY SYSTEM. RECEIVING GUIDANCE AND DIRECTION FROM THESE AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS HAS ENHANCED THE EFFECTIVENESS OF FLORIDA'S DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS PROGRAM.

WE HAVE ALSO COORDINATED WELL WITH THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE. DURING THE PAST TWO YEARS THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION MANAGED THE DISCRETIONARY FUNDS ALLOCATED TO THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE FOR COMMUNITY-BASED PROGRAMS. THESE PROGRAMS INCLUDE 27 COMMUNITY-BASED PROJECTS AND NINE STATEWIDE COOPERATIVE ORGANIZATIONS. NEXT YEAR THESE PROGRAMS WILL BE MANAGED BY THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE.

WE HAVE JOINED EFFORTS TO IMPLEMENT THE DARE PROGRAM AND HAVE JOINTLY SPONSORED SUCCESSFUL STATEWIDE PREVENTION CONFERENCES. WE ANTICIPATE EXPANDING THESE COOPERATIVE EFFORTS AS OUR PROGRAM DEVELOPS. BY WORKING TOGETHER WITH THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE WE RECOGNIZE THAT OUR PROGRAMS WILL BE A MORE EFFICIENT USE OF THE LIMITED AVAILABLE RESOURCES.

INCREASING THE NEW FEDERAL DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT BUDGET TO $367 MILLION DOLLARS IS A STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION. IT DOES NOT, HOWEVER, REFLECT AN ADEQUATE COMMITMENT TO PREVENTING OUR COUNTRY'S SCHOOL CHILDREN, PARTICULARLY OUR HIGH-RISK SCHOOL CHILDREN, FROM BECOMING SUBSTANCE USERS. THIS BUDGET IS LESS THAN THE AMOUNT USED TO BUILD A SINGLE B-2 BOMBER. AMERICA WOULD SURVIVE WITHOUT ONE MORE B-2 BOMBER, BUT WE CANNOT SURVIVE IF WE LOSE THE WAR ON DRUGS. WE MUST HAVE ADDITIONAL RESOURCES IF WE ARE TO WIN THIS WAR AND SAVE OUR COUNTRY'S YOUTH.

IT IS OUR HIGH-RISK CHILDREN WHO ARE MOST IN DANGER OF BECOMING CHEMICALLY DEPENDENT AND/OR ENTERING OUR PRISONS BECAUSE OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE. IF THEY DO ENTER OUR TREATMENT OR CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM, IT WILL COST APPROXIMATELY $60.00 PER DAY FOR TREATMENT OR APPROXIMATELY $70.00 PER DAY TO BE HOUSED IN ONE OF FLORIDA'S OVERCROWDED PRISONS. YET, THIS YEAR WE ARE ONLY RECEIVING $3.74 PER CHILD IN FEDERAL FUNDING FOR OUR DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS PROGRAMS.

WE SEE PREVENTION AS AN INVESTMENT TO REDUCE FUTURE PROBLEMS LIKE CHEMICAL DEPENDENCY AND CRIME. INTERVENTION IS AN EXPENSIVE PART OF PREVENTION. OUR DRUG SURVEY SHOWED A LOT OF KIDS NEED INTERVENTION NOW. THE EXISTING MONEY DOES NOT COVER INTERVENTION NEEDS. INCREASING THE FEDERAL ALLOCATION TO FLORIDA, AS WELL AS ALL STATES, WOULD DECREASE THE NEED FOR HIGH PRICED TREATMENT FACILITIES

AND PRISON SPACE. WE KNOW FLORIDA'S NOT ALONE IN THIS FIGHT. BUT, WE HAVE TAKEN SOME STRONG STEPS TOWARD WINNING THIS BATTLE.

IN SUMMARY, WE HAVE OPENED THE INNOVATIVE PREVENTION CENTER. THE LEGISLATURE MANDATED THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS PROGRAM. WE HAVE EXTENSIVE STATE NETWORKING SYSTEMS, WORKING IN CONCERT WITH PARENT, HEALTH AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ORGANIZATIONS, AS WELL AS FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES. WE HAVE A STRONG COMMITMENT FROM LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES TO IMPLEMENT PROGRAMS TAILORED TO THEIR COMMUNITIES. AND, WE HAVE STRONG LEADERSHIP FROM COMMISSIONER CASTOR.

AT THE STATE LEVEL WE WILL CONTINUE TO FOCUS ON SHARING SUCCESSFUL DRUG-FREE PROGRAMS THROUGHOUT FLORIDA AND ENCOURAGE THE LOCAL DISTRICTS TO EXPLORE WHAT OTHERS IN THE FIELD ARE ACCOMPLISHING.

COMMISSIONER CASTOR SENDS HER REGARDS AND ENCOURAGEMENT TO THIS COMMITTEE. SHE IS APPRECIATIVE OF THE DIRECTION AND LEADERSHIP THIS COMMITTEE HAS LENT TO THE CITIZENS OF FLORIDA. THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN - AND THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE - FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY TO SHARE FLORIDA'S PROGRAMS.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE DIRECTORS
444 North Capitol Street, N.W. • Suite 520 • Washington, D.C. 20001 • (202) 783-6868

TESTIMONY OF

WILLIAM J. MCCORD

DIRECTOR

COMMISSION ON ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

and

MEMBER

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE ALCOHOL AND
DRUG ABUSE DIRECTORS

before the

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL
UNITED STATE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

on

IMPLEMENTATION OF DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS
AND COMMUNITIES PROGRAM

JULY 26, 1989

GOOD MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE. THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO APPEAR BEFORE YOU TODAY TO ADDRESS THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FEDERAL DRUG FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES PROGRAM.

MY NAME IS WILLIAM J. MCCORD. I AM DIRECTOR OF THE ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE COMMISSION FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND AM APPEARING BEFORE YOU TODAY AS A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE DIRECTORS, INC. (NASADAD). NASADAD IS A NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION WHOSE MEMBERSHIP IS COMPRISED EXCLUSIVELY OF THE STATE AND TERRITORIAL OFFICIALS DESIGNATED BY THE GOVERNORS TO ADMINISTER THE PUBLICLY FUNDED ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION, INTERVENTION AND TREATMENT SYSTEM.

AS YOU KNOW, THE DRUG FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT PROGRAMS WERE FIRST AUTHORIZED BY THE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ACT OF 1986 (P.L. 99-570) AND CONTAINED SEVERAL COMPONENTS, THE LARGEST OF WHICH IS THE STATE AND LOCAL GRANTS WHICH ALLOCATES FUNDS TO THE STATES TO ASSIST IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A BROAD RANGE OF EDUCATION, PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION ACTIVITIES. EACH STATE'S ALLOTMENT IS DIVIDED BETWEEN THE STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY WHICH RECEIVES 70 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL ALLOCATION AND THE OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR, WHICH RECEIVES THE REMAINING 30 PERCENT OF FUNDS.

NINETY (90) PERCENT OF THE FUNDS ALLOTTED TO THE STATE EDUCATION

PREVENTION FIELD. THE NATIONAL PREVENTION NETWORK IS COMPRISED OF INDIVIDUALS APPOINTED BY EACH OF THE NASADAD DIRECTORS WHO WORK TO ENSURE THE PROVISION OF QUALITY AND EFFECTIVE ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION IN THE STATES AND TERRITORIES. NPN PROVIDES A COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK FOR THE FIELD OF PREVENTION AND ADVOCATES PREVENTION EFFORTS DESIGNED TO REDUCE THE INCIDENCE AND PREVALENCE OF ALCOHOL- AND OTHER DRUG-RELATED PROBLEMS AND PROMOTE OVERALL HEALTH AND WELLNESS.

THE NASADAD AND NPN MEMBERS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR ADMINISTERING A BROAD RANGE OF PREVENTION ACTIVITIES, INCLUDING THOSE SUPPORTED BY THE OFFICE OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION (OSAP) WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AND THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. REGARDING STATE ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE AGENCY INVOLVEMENT WITH THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES PROGRAMS, APPROXIMATELY ONE-HALF OF THE AGENCIES HAVE COMPLETE OR PARTIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR MANAGING THE GOVERNORS' 10 PERCENT DISCRETIONARY FUNDS. THE REMAINING STATES REPORT VARYING LEVELS OF INVOLVEMENT WITH THE PROGRAM THROUGH COMMUNICATION WITH THEIR GOVERNORS' OFFICES, PARTICIPATION IN SPECIAL TASK FORCES AND DEVELOPMENT OF JOINT PROJECTS WITH EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS.

ATTACHED TO MY TESTIMONY AS APPENDIX 1 IS A STATE BY STATE LISTING OF THE STATE AGENCIES THAT ADMINISTER THE GOVERNORS' 10 PERCENT MONIES.

AGENCY ARE REQUIRED TO BE DISTRIBUTED TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES TO IMPROVE ANTI-DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION, PREVENTION, EARLY INTERVENTION AND REHABILITATION REFERRAL PROGRAMS. THE GOVERNORS' 10 PERCENT DISCRETIONARY FUNDS PROVIDE FINANCIAL SUPPORT TO VARIED COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS. ADDITIONALLY, AT LEAST 50 PERCENT OF THE GOVERNORS' FUNDS MUST BE USED FOR PROGRAMS FOR HIGH RISK YOUTH.

ROLE OF STATE ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE DIRECTORS IN ADMINISTERING DRUG FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT MONIES

THE STATE ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE AGENCIES HAVE PLAYED AN IMPORTANT ROLE NATIONWIDE IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION STRATEGIES SINCE THE EARLY 1970S WHEN FEDERAL LEGISLATION FIRST AUTHORIZED FUNDING FOR PREVENTION SERVICES. SINCE THAT TIME, THE FIELD OF PREVENTION HAS GROWN RAPIDLY AS EVIDENCED BY A TREMENDOUS INCREASE IN PROGRAMMING AND A CONCOMITANT INCREASE IN THE PUBLIC'S AWARENESS OF PROBLEMS RELATED TO THE USE OF ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUGS. THESE FACTS, COUPLED WITH GREATER LEGISLATIVE INTEREST IN THIS AREA, HAVE BROUGHT MORE PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS INTO THE FIELD THAN EVER BEFORE.

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE DIRECTORS AND ITS AFFILIATE ORGANIZATION, THE NATIONAL PREVENTION NETWORK (NPN) WORK TOGETHER TO PROVIDE NATIONAL LEADERSHIP TO THE

24-274 0 - 90 - 3

EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES FUNDED BY THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT

THE STATE ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE AGENCIES THAT ADMINISTER SOME OR ALL OF THE GOVERNORS' 30 PERCENT DISCRETIONARY FUNDS PROVIDED INFORMATION TO NASADAD ON HOW THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT MONIES WERE BEING USED.

ATTACHED TO MY TESTIMONY AS APPENDIX II IS A STATE BY STATE LISTING OF PARTICULAR PROJECTS FUNDED WITH THE 30 PERCENT MONIES.

AS NOTED IN THE BEGINNING OF MY TESTIMONY, THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT REQUIRES A STRONG EMPHASIS ON PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES TARGETING HIGH RISK YOUTH. AS SUCH, A NUMBER OF STATE ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE AGENCIES REPORT THAT DUE TO THEIR AGENCY'S RECEIPT OF THESE NEW FUNDS, EXPANDED EFFORTS FOCUSING ON HIGH RISK YOUTH HAVE OCCURRED.

HIGHLIGHTS OF STATE ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE AGENCY EDUCATION AND PREVENTION PROGRAMS INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

- CALIFORNIA HAS DEVELOPED A DRUG SUPPRESSION IN THE SCHOOLS PROGRAM, AS WELL AS CULTURALLY SENSITIVE HIGH RISK YOUTH PROJECTS;

- THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HAS INITIATED "PARADE"-

PARENTS RALLY AGAINST DRUG ABUSE AND "PROJECT OUTREACH" IN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE HOUSING;

- GEORGIA STARTED A 24-HOUR STATEWIDE HOT-LINE FOR CONSULTATION AND TREATMENT REFERRAL AND IN THEIR PREVENTION RESOURCE CENTERS HAS A TEAM OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SPECIALISTS TO WORK WITH COMMUNITIES WANTING TO ESTABLISH PREVENTION PROGRAMS;

- ILLINOIS HAS HIRED FULL-TIME PREVENTION SPECIALISTS IN THE "FAMILIES OF THE FUTURE AREAS" (THOSE AREAS WITH THE HIGHEST INCIDENCE AND PREVALENCE OF INFANT MORTALITY);

- NEW YORK HAS DEVELOPED "COLLEGES OF THE SENECA", A PREVENTION PROGRAM FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS, "TEEN FOCUS" AND A SERIES OF PREVENTION VIDEOS DISTRIBUTED THROUGH PUBLIC LIBRARIES;

- OHIO HAS IMPLEMENTED TWELVE PROGRAMS THAT TARGET HIGH RISK YOUTH AND THREE MAJOR COMMUNITY PREVENTION PROJECTS, AS WELL AS A PREVENTION TRAINING PROGRAM FOR TEACHERS;

- PENNSYLVANIA HAS STARTED "PROJECT PRIDE" IN PHILADELPHIA AND IS INCORPORATING PREVENTION ACTIVITIES

WITHIN THE BIG BROTHERS, BIG SISTERS PROGRAM.

- SOUTH CAROLINA HAS PLACED A PRIMARY PREVENTION SPECIALIST IN EVERY COUNTY; FUNDED DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS TARGETING URBAN HIGH RISK YOUTH; AND STARTED SPECIAL "OUTDOOR INITIATIVES".

SUGGESTIONS FOR AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT IN OPERATION OF DRUG FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACTIVITIES

IN A RECENT SURVEY CONDUCTED BY NASADAD, THE STATE ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE AGENCIES WERE ASKED THEIR VIEWS ON HOW THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES PROGRAMS WERE WORKING AND FOR THEIR SUGGESTIONS ON HOW THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COULD IMPROVE THE PROGRAM.

1. FUNDING

SEVERAL STATES REPORTED THAT THEY BELIEVED THE PROGRAM TO BE RUN FAIRLY WELL IN THEIR STATES AND THAT THE FUNDS AVAILABLE TO THE STATES HAVE ENABLED THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF SPECIAL PROJECTS THAT PREVIOUSLY WERE IMPOSSIBLE BECAUSE OF A LACK OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES.

A NUMBER OF STATES CALLED UPON THE CONGRESS AND THE ADMINISTRATION TO GUARANTEE FUNDING FOR A LONGER PERIOD OF TIME

SINCE IT TAKES TIME TO GEAR UP FOR NEW PROGRAMS AND TO HIRE AND TRAIN STAFF. STATES ALSO MENTIONED THAT THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD HAVE AUTHORITY TO PLACE MORE RESTRICTIONS AND CRITERIA ON HOW THE LOCAL SCHOOLS SPEND THE MONIES TO AVOID WASTING PRECIOUS FEDERAL RESOURCES.

2. COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION

SOME STATES RESPONDED THAT THE ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE AGENCY WORKS CLOSELY AND COOPERATIVELY WITH THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND/OR THE GOVERNORS' OFFICES TO COORDINATE EDUCATION AND PREVENTION PROGRAMMING. HOWEVER, A MAJORITY OF STATES REPORTED THAT THERE WAS A NEED FOR ENHANCED COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION WITH THE ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE AGENCIES. ONE STATE RESPONDED THAT THE FEDERAL AND STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION SHOULD WORK MORE CLOSELY WITH THE ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE AGENCIES AND "USE THEIR EXPERIENCE."
SEVERAL STATES MENTIONED THAT BECAUSE OF A LACK OF COMMUNICATION, THERE WERE PROBLEMS AS TO WHAT STATES CAN AND CANNOT DO WITH THE MONEY.

GREATER COOPERATION IS NEEDED BETWEEN THE FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES DEALING WITH ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG ABUSE ISSUES, PARTICULARLY THE OFFICE FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION (OSAP). SINCE OSAP FOCUSES PRIMARILY COMMUNITY BASED PREVENTION RESEARCH AND SERVICES FOR HIGH RISK YOUTH, THEIR

KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERIENCE COULD BE HELPFUL TO EDUCATORS.

IN ADDITION TO WORKING MORE COOPERATIVELY WITH OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCIES, DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION ARE ENCOURAGED TO INVOLVE MORE FULLY INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS WITHIN THEIR LOCAL COMMUNITIES. ONE STATE COMMENTED THAT "WE DO NOT RELY ENOUGH ON LOCAL NEEDS AND DISCRETION: LET SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND LOCAL BOARDS DETERMINE FOR THEMSELVES WHAT THEIR NEEDS ARE.

3. ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES

STATES SUGGESTED A NUMBER OF CHANGES RELATING TO THE STRUCTURE AND ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT. ALTHOUGH THE INTENT OF CONGRESS SEEMS TO BE TO REACH HIGH RISK YOUTH, STATES BELIEVE THERE IS A REAL NEED TO TARGET EDUCATION AND PRIMARY PREVENTION ACTIVITIES TO YOUNGER CHILDREN. SEVERAL STATES FELT THAT THE GUIDELINES THAT LIMIT THE USE OF HIGH RISK YOUTH FUNDS SHOULD BE BROADENED TO REACH MORE CHILDREN WHO MAY NOT MEET THE STRICT DEFINITION OF HIGH RISK AND TO MAKE IT EASIER TO MAINSTREAM HIGH RISK CHILDREN.

ADDITIONALLY, IT WAS SUGGESTED THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD STRENGTHEN THE GUIDELINES DEALING WITH SCHOOLS AND THE BROADER COMMUNITY. "A SCHOOL-COMMUNITY EMPHASIS IS IMPORTANT AND SHOULD BE STRESSED."

SOME STATES OFFERED SUGGESTIONS RELATING TO THE VARIOUS REPORTING REQUIREMENTS. WHILE STATES RECOGNIZE THE VALUE OF REPORTING ON THE ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN, IT IS DIFFICULT TO IMPLEMENT REPORTING CHANGES ONCE PROGRAMS ARE UNDERWAY. ALSO, TO ENABLE THE STATES TO COMPLY WITH STRINGENT REPORTING AND DATA COLLECTION REQUIREMENTS, THERE SHOULD BE AN INCREASE IN THE STATES' ADMINISTRATIVE ALLOWANCE.

AMONG STATES THERE IS THE BELIEF THAT THE EVALUATIVE CRITERIA AND ANNUAL REPORT INFORMATION IS TOO HEAVILY ORIENTED TOWARD HEAD COUNTS AND SERVICE COUNTS PER TARGET GROUP. THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD HAVE MORE DISCRETION TO DEVELOP MORE MEANINGFUL EVALUATION CRITERIA. CURRENTLY, WHAT A STATE MAY CONSIDER A LEGITIMATE PREVENTION ACTIVITY MAY NOT FIT THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS CRITERIA AND THUS, CANNOT BE DONE.

CONCLUSION

FOR CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS IN SCHOOL, EDUCATION PROGRAMS THAT HAVE DEMONSTRATED POTENTIAL EFFECTIVENESS IN REDUCING ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG USE, INCLUDING THOSE DESIGNED TO TEACH YOUNG PEOPLE HOW TO RESIST SOCIAL PRESSURES TO USE TOBACCO, ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUGS, CAN HAVE A POSITIVE IMPACT IN REDUCING THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN WHO BEGIN TO SMOKE, DRINK AND USE MARIJUANA. SUCH PROGRAMS ARE PARTICULARLY IMPORTANT FOR CHILDREN AT RISK, SUCH AS ALCOHOLIC OR DRUG ABUSING PARENTS.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS UNIQUELY SITUATED TO PROVIDE THE NECESSARY LEADERSHIP AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ON ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG EDUCATION TO STATES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES. HOWEVER, ALL PARTIES INVOLVED SHOULD RECOGNIZE THAT DRUG EDUCATION WILL YIELD POSITIVE RESULTS ONLY IF IMPLEMENTED CONSISTENTLY OVER TIME AND IN CONJUNCTION WITH OTHER PREVENTION EFFORTS. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD PROVIDE STATES WITH CONSISTENT AND RELIABLE FUNDING. STATES AND SCHOOL BOARDS, FOR THEIR PART, SHOULD REALIZE THAT ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG PROBLEMS DO NOT REPRESENT SHORT-TERM CRISES SUSCEPTIBLE TO QUICK FIXES. ONE-SHOT OR SHORT-TERM CAMPAIGNS AND EVENTS HAVE NOT HAD A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. ONGOING COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMS THROUGHOUT THE SCHOOL YEAR AND ACROSS ALL GRADE LEVELS ARE ESSENTIAL TO A SUCCESSFUL EDUCATION EFFORT.

SCHOOL-BASED ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG EDUCATION PROGRAMS ARE AT BEST ONLY ONE COMPONENT OF A MEANINGFUL PREVENTION POLICY. SCHOOL PROGRAMS FAIL TO REACH ADOLESCENTS WHO HAVE DROPPED OUT OF SCHOOL OR WHO ARE IN NEED OF SUPPORT BEYOND WHAT SCHOOLS CAN PROVIDE. EDUCATION APPROACHES ARE ASSURED GREATER SUCCESS IF THEY INVOLVE AND RECEIVE SUPPORT FROM A BROAD SPECTRUM OF THE COMMUNITY INCLUDING PARENTS, TEACHERS, POLICE, DRUG AND ALCOHOL PROFESSIONALS, OTHER HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS, ELECTED OFFICIALS, JUDGES, MEDIA, AND OF COURSE, YOUTH THEMSELVES. TOGETHER WE CAN CREATE ENVIRONMENTS WHERE REMAINING DRUG FREE BECOMES THE NORM AND A GREATER SENSE OF SELF ESTEEM AND CONTROL ARE FOSTERED.

E03

RECENT EVIDENCE SUGGESTS THAT ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG ABUSE AMONG ADOLESCENTS IS ASSOCIATED WITH MULTIPLE RISK AND RESILIENCY FACTORS THAT ARE INHERENT WITHIN THE ENVIRONMENT (E.G., AVAILABILITY OF ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUGS, FAMILY, MEDIA, PEERS, ETC.) AND THE INDIVIDUAL'S INTERACTION WITH THE ENVIRONMENT, AS WELL AS FACTORS THAT ARE INHERENT WITHIN THE INDIVIDUAL (E.G., GENETICS, PERSONALITY, PHYSICAL HEALTH, ETC.). THUS, ANY PREVENTIVE INTERVENTION IS LIKELY TO BE MORE EFFECTIVE IF IT FOCUSES ON REDUCING THE POWER OF RISK FACTORS AND INCREASING THE POTENCY OF RESILIENCY FACTORS ACROSS MULTIPLE ENVIRONMENTAL LEVELS. INTEGRAL TO THE SUCCESS OF ANY SCHOOL-BASED PROGRAM IS A MANDATE FOR COLLABORATIVE, COORDINATED PROGRAMMING WITHIN THE COMMUNITY THAT REINFORCES THE PREVENTION MESSAGE AND PROVIDES FOR CONSISTENT PUBLIC POLICY. HENCE, NASADAD ENCOURAGES THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION TO PLACE INCREASED EMPHASIS IN ITS GUIDELINES ON COMMUNITY-BASED APPROACHES TO PREVENTION.

APPENDIX I

State Agency Administering Governors' 10% Drug-Free Schools and Communities Monies

STATE	ADMINISTERING AGENCY
ALABAMA	Governor's Office
ALASKA	Department of Education
ARIZONA	Governor's Office
ARKANSAS	Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency
CALIFORNIA	Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency
COLORADO	50% - Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency 50% - Governor's Office
CONNECTICUT	Office of Policy and Management
DELAWARE	Department of Public Instruction
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency
FLORIDA	
GEORGIA	Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency
HAWAII	
IDAHO	Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency
ILLINOIS	40% - Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency; portion to Police Department and Governor
INDIANA	Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency
IOWA	50% - Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency; 50% - Governor's Alliance
KANSAS	50% - Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency; 50% - Governor
KENTUCKY	
LOUISIANA	Department of Education
MAINE	Department of Education
MARYLAND	Governor's Office of Justice Assistance
MASSACHUSETTS	Governor's Alliance Against Drugs
MICHIGAN	Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency
MINNESOTA	State Planning Agency
MISSISSIPPI	Department of Public Safety
MISSOURI	Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency
MONTANA	Department of Justice
NEBRASKA	25% - Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency
NEVADA	Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency
NEW HAMPSHIRE	Governor's Task Force
NEW JERSEY	Department of Education
NEW MEXICO	
NEW YORK	Task Force on Integrated Projects
NORTH CAROLINA	

STATE	ADMINISTERING AGENCY
NORTH DAKOTA	
OHIO	Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency
OKLAHOMA	Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency
OREGON	Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency
PENNSYLVANIA	Department of Education and Drug Policy Council
PUERTO RICO	Department of Education
RHODE ISLAND	50% - Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency
SOUTH CAROLINA	Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency
SOUTH DAKOTA	Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency
TENNESSEE	
TEXAS	Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency
UTAH	Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency
VERMONT	20% - Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency
VIRGIN ISLANDS	Department of Human Services' Division of Youth and Family Services
VIRGINIA	Department of Education, Governor's Advisory Group
WASHINGTON	Governor's Office - Department of Community Development
WEST VIRGINIA	Office of Community and Industrial Development
WISCONSIN	Alcohol and Drug Abuse Agency
WYOMING	Drug Policy Board

APPENDIX II

Examples of Programs Funded with Drug-Free Schools and Communities Funds

Arkansas

- Community prevention service projects and a high risk youth;
- Prevention and intervention service;
- Formation of "Arkansans for Drug-Free Youth".

California

- High risk youth programs;
- Drug suppression in schools programs;
- Programs focusing on alcohol related birth defects/prenatal drug issues.

Colorado

- "Partners" program aimed at high risk youth;
- A diversion project in Mesa that includes treatment;
- Pikes Peak Care Coalition aimed at high risk youth.

District of Columbia

- "PARADE" - Parents Rally Against Drug Abuse;
- Project Outreach in public assistance housing;
- Prevention activities aimed at high risk youth.

Georgia

- 24 hour statewide hotline for consultation and treatment referral;

- Prevention Resource Centers - a team of four technical assistance specialists to provide assistance to communities wanting to establish prevention programs.

Idaho

- Formation of "PAYADA" - Parents and Youth Against Drug Abuse;
- Implementation of "BABES";
- Community development and mobilization projects.

Illinois

- Four innovative prevention programs;
- Hired full-time prevention specialist in the " Families of the Future Areas" (those areas with the highest incidence of infant mortality.

Indiana

- "Choices" - the City of Elkhart contracts with providers who assess the prevention needs of the city;
- Marion County Prosecutors Office - provide drugscreening, intervention and prevention.

Iowa

- Comprehensive community based programs;
- School team intervention programs;
- Diversions projects.

Kansas

- Almost all of the money goes to the regional prevention centers across the State.

Maryland

- "After-School Program" - a cooperative effort targeting two schools that provide activities for children in economically disadvantaged areas.

Massachusetts

- "Common" - a peer leadership program;
- Afterschool groups for children of alcohol and drug abusers or children who are substance abusers.

Michigan

- Phoenix Alternative High School - for dropouts and high risk youth;
- Culturally sensitive programs for Native Americans;
- Development of student assistance programs.

Missouri

- Alternative School in Kansas City for children not accepted in other schools;
- Training of 15-20 school teams to develop high risk youth programs.

Nebraska

- 33 mini grant programs for Just Say No;
- Formation of Youth Against Alcohol and Drugs.

Nevada

- Sports programs for high risk youth referred by schools and other groups;
- Wilderness program in Reno;
- Prevention programs conducted by Boy Scouts.

New Hampshire

- Implementation of "Here's Looking at You, Too";
- Hiring of student assistance coordinator.

New York

- Colleges of the Seneca - prevention program for college students;

- "Teen Focus"
- Support to Councils on Alcoholism;
- Creation of videos distributed through libraries.

Oklahoma

- High risk youth project in public housing;
- Centers for prevention programs that provide resources, training and consultation.

Ohio

- Twelve programs that target high risk youth;
- Three major community prevention projects;
- Prevention training program focusing on teachers.

Oregon

- Majority of funds assist in development of student assistance programs.

Pennsylvania

- "Project Pride" in Philadelphia;
- Big Brothers, Big Sisters programs;
- Project Core - teacher trainees under Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency.

Rhode Island

- 10 prevention sites serving high risk youth;
- "Project Risk", a structured skills building program.

South Carolina

- A primary prevention specialist has been placed in every county;
- Demonstration projects targeting urban high-risk youth;
- "Outdoor initiatives".

South Dakota

- Statewide implementation of the DARE program;
- Support implementation of comprehensive health education.

Utah

- Contract with Utah Federation of Drug-Free Youth;
- Community Counseling Center in Salt Lake City provides living skills program for high risk youth.

Vermont

- "Alternatives for Teens", ongoing support groups in the schools;
- Provide scholarships to Vermont educators to attend the New England School of Addiction Studies.

Wisconsin

- 18 grants for high risk youth, including children of drug abusing women, teens in corrections facilities and children on Indian reservations.

Wyoming

- DARE programs;
- Special projects for Big Brothers and Big Sisters programs.

THE COUNCIL OF THE GREAT CITY SCHOOLS
1413 K Street N.W. 4th Floor Washington D.C. 20005 (202) 371-0163

Testimony
on
Federal Drug Abuse Policy in Education

Albuquerque
Atlanta
Baltimore
Boston
Buffalo
Chicago
Cincinnati
Cleveland
Columbus
Dade County
Dallas
Dayton
Denver
Detroit
East Baton Rouge
El Paso
Fresno
Houston
Indianapolis
Long Beach
Los Angeles
Memphis
Milwaukee
Minneapolis
Nashville
New Orleans
New York City
Norfolk
Oakland
Omaha
Philadelphia
Phoenix
Pittsburgh
Portland
Rochester
St. Louis
St. Paul
San Diego
San Francisco
Seattle
Toledo
Tucson
Tulsa
Wake County
Washington, D.C.

before the
Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control
U.S. House of Representatives

Presented by
Edward Zubrow
Special Assistant to the Superintendent
Philadelphia Public Schools

Accompanied by
Gwen Porter
Project Director for Student Substance Abuse
Philadelphia Public Schools

On Behalf of
The Council of The Great City Schools

July 26, 1989
Washington, DC

Testimony on Federal Drug Abuse Policy in Education
before the
House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control
on behalf of
The Council of the Great City Schools

Mr. Chairman, my name is Edward Zubrow. I am the Special Assistant for Drug Education to the Superintendent of the Philadelphia Public Schools. With me is Gwen Porter, the Drug Abuse Program Director for the Philadelphia Public Schools. We are pleased to appear before you this morning on behalf of the Council of the Great City Schools.

Currently in its 33rd year, the Council Of The Great City Schools is a national organization comprised of 46 of the nation's largest urban public school systems. On our Board of Directors sit the Superintendent and a Board of Education member from each city, making The Council the only independent education group so constituted and the only one whose membership and purpose is solely urban.

The Council's membership serves over five million inner-city youngsters, or approximately 12% of the nation's public school enrollment. About one-third of the country's Black children, 27% of the Hispanic children and 20% of the nation's Asian children are being educated in our schools. Nearly 30% of all poor children in the nation are found in our forty-six cities.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the invitation to testify before this crucial Committee on federal drug abuse policy for our schools. I would also like to thank you for your leadership and advocacy in this area.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer a few general observation about the federal government's response to our nation's drug problems as

they relate to schools, particularly in our inner-cities; describe what we are doing to address these challenges; and discuss what we think remains to be done.

In general, Mr. Chairman, we would have to give the federal government a "C" grade in its leadership in preventing drug abuse in our schools. The previous administration, in particular, was not helpful in either its budget requests or its rhetoric. The attempt to halve the Congressional allocation for the Drug Free Schools Act several years ago was outrageous, and the proposal to test our students for drugs was unfeasible. The Administration's best effort was the publication of What Works: Schools Without Drugs.

While the new Administration shows less overt hostility to our efforts in controlling drug abuse, it also shows little leadership. Too little has emerged from the Department of Education to-date to demonstrate that it takes this problem seriously. Its budget request was woefully inadequate, and its proposals largely uncreative. We have not seen from the Department of Education yet any serious evidence of commitment for addressing the drug problem or description of how it fits into the Administration's overall purported war on drugs.

One proposal from the Department, however, that deserves serious attention by Congress is its "Drug Free Schools Urban Emergency Grants", as contained in H.R. 1675. This bill would authorize $25 million in one-time grants for urban school systems having the most severe drug problems. Communities of every kind are experiencing problems with drug use, but the situation in our major cities is staggering. While the proposal is small, it would provide assistance where the need is greatest and would correct, in part, one of the deficiencies in the current Drug-Free Schools Act, the lack of targeting.

Congress currently appropriates about $354.5 million nationally for the drug-abuse education efforts under the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, of which inner-city schools receive about $13.7 million or 4.0% -- in contrast to the 12% of the nation's students they enroll, most of which are highly at-risk of drug use. Not only is the $9.0 (on average) spent per child by the federal government inadequate to address the nation's drug problems, but the $3.50 spent for each urban child borders on the scandalous. In short, the federal education effort short changes the area where the problem is most acute: the cities.

Despite this deficiency in federal support, local urban schools are grappling with their drug problems using funds from the Drug Free Schools Act. In Philadelphia we are using a five-point strategy that includes: prevention and intervention programs, community outreach, staff development and training, school board policy, and cooperative ventures with law enforcement and other city agencies. Our total budget for these efforts is approximately $1,422,375 in 1988-89, of which our federal portion is $519,353 or 36.5%. This budget reflects contributions from the school district, city, state, and corporate community.

1. Prevention and Education. The Philadelphia Public Schools teach a standardized curricula to all children grades K-12 on substance abuse through our Department of Health and Physical Education. This effort is supplemented by a variety of education projects, including:

- o Here's Looking At You -- 2000, a state approved drug and alcohol abuse prevention curricula for students grades K-6. Emphasis is placed on social skills, bonding, refusal skills, and understanding the effects of chemical dependence.
- o Project Pride, a program in our schools run by the Jewish Family and Children's Service Agency emphasizing prevention and early intervention in middle schools.

- Project D.A.R.E., a nationally-known cooperative venture with the Philadelphia Police Department.

2. Intervention and Referral. Our schools also provide a number of programs emphasizing intervention and referral.

- Rites of Passage, a high school program for 48,000 youth designed to deliver prevention and early intervention services through peer group counseling.

- Student Assistance Program (SAP) assists school faculty in identifying substance abuse problems and providing appropriate referrals to the drug and alcohol, and mental health systems using a team of administrators, nurses, counselors trained in adolescent chemical dependence, group work, recovery and aftercare.

3. Outreach. Philadelphia's schools also work closely with the community through two other efforts:

- Operation Kinship, which provides workshops, seminars and training sessions for parents, community groups, churches and other organizations.

- Teenage Parents Program provides prevention and early intervention services to 300 pregnant and parenting teens who are substance abusers living in public housing or shelters.

4. Staff Development. In addition, the Philadelphia School District is implementing an on-going staff development effort to help faculty and nonteaching personnel recognize and report signs of abuse, as well as to allow specially trained personnel to intervene and provide appropriate referral and treatment.

5. Policy and Enforcement. The Philadelphia Board of Education has also enacted new policies banning the possession by students of beepers, expelling students for incidents involving drugs and weapons, and establishing a "Security Operations Task Force" to investigate any drug activity in the schools.

6. Cooperative Ventures With Other Agencies. Finally, the Philadelphia Schools are collaborating with other agencies in fighting drugs and providing leadership through a number of other efforts:

- Drug Free School Zones, designated around schools to call attention to the federal legislation and to establish a "zero tolerance" policy within 1000 feet of a school. Efforts are also underway to coordinate efforts with the Police Department, District Attorney's office, and the U.S. Attorney's Office.
- Partnerships also form a major component of our work, as we have developed cooperative agreements with the regional health care providers, the social service delivery system, and the private sector.

Efforts in Philadelphia are similar to those in other city public school systems across the nation. The evaluations of these efforts nationwide indicate that drug-abuse education, as a component in a community-wide program, can work, especially when designed to influence youngsters to resist peer pressures, not just provide information or boost self-esteem. Previous programs designed solely to teach our youth about the dangers of drugs or to raise self-confidence had positive effects but were not sufficient to reduce drug-use significantly, leading many to think that education efforts were ineffective.

Quite the opposite is true, however, when these educational efforts use peer pressure. Education programs in these cases were particularly effective in reducing the initial use of "gateway" drugs -- an important predictor of later use. Evaluations of the A.L.E.R.T. program in California, the S.T.A.R. program in Kansas City, and the Seattle Social Development Project appear to bear this out. Recent research reviews of some 240 studies also showed that drug-abuse education, based mostly in schools, was effective when it used a strong peer component in reducing drug-abuse.

In short, Mr. Chairman, we are convinced that drug abuse education efforts in our schools are an essential component in our nation's overall strategy against drugs.

And the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act is an important part of our efforts locally. Our federal funds were used to purchase the "Here's Looking At You" curricula, provide teacher training, set up a faculty resource library and design the Student Assistance Program (SAP). Evaluations of these specific efforts on student drug use will be ready at the end of the next school year. Our preliminary findings, however, show that 96% of the program's participants rated their experience as highly positive.

More needs to be done, however, at our level and yours. We see first hand, everyday, the effects that those drugs have on our youth. Too many of our inner-city youth are being lost in a never-ending maelstrom of despair, drugs, poverty, neglect, abuse, and isolation.

The federal government could be more helpful to us at the local level if it would consider the following recommendations:

a. Increase the funding for the Drug-Free Schools and Community Act to $1.0 billion annually.

b. Modify the current Drug-Free Schools authorization to distribute 95% (rather than 75%) of its funds to the local school system level.

c. Target funds under the Drug-Free Schools Act to areas of high poverty using the Chapter 1 (ESEA) formula.

d. Require the Department of Education to develop and test more program models for dissemination to the local level.

e. Provide funds to the Department of Education for curricula development and teacher training packages for dissemination to the local level.

f. Authorize federal funds for school-based health clinics that would provide sex health education, health care and drug monitoring.

g. Encourage the Secretary of Education to provide national leadership in the schools' role in drug-abuse prevention.

h. Place greater emphasis on school-based prevention programs in the Secretary's discretionary fund.

i. Incorporate drug abuse education in other federal programs, e.g. nutrition education, AIDS prevention, Chapter 2, day care and teen pregnancy programs, and programs serving infants born to chemically addicted parents.

j. Retain but do not expand the current federal requirements for local assurances on drug policies.

k. Approve the Administration's urban schools emergency grants.

Thank you very much for this opportunity to testify. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Federal Drug-Free Schools Programs
in Selected Large City Schools*

- Boston: Used its federal allocation of $167,907 in 1987-88 to purchase state-developed curriculum, D.E.C.I.D.E.; pay for a central office coordinator; and provide stipends for teachers in grades 4 through 7 for training after hours and on weekends. The school system also used an additional $200,000 from the Secretary's discretionary fund for miniawards to 16 schools (8 secondary, 4 middle and 4 elementary) for surveys, data collection, and the establishment of referral systems to outside agencies and for student support systems. The discretionary award was not renewed for 1988-89 and the district will have to scale back some referral systems. The Boston Schools will receive $207,063 in formula funds in 1988-89.

  How Boston Would Use Additional Federal Money: Would extend curriculum and training to other grade levels beyond the current 4, 5, 6 and 7 grades; and would expand the referral systems designed with Secretary's discretionary funds.

- Philadelphia: Used its $427,687 federal allocation in 1987-88 for purchasing "Here's Looking At You 2000" curriculum packages, training 84 lead teachers in grades K-6 on use of the package, establishing a faculty resources library, and designing a Student Assessment Program (SAP). The SAP effort was designed as an intervention strategy and involved training additional teachers on how to identify active student drug users. Teachers trained in the curriculum and through SAP were instructed in how to set up drug awareness faculty committees in each school.

  How Philadelphia Would Use Additional Federal Money: Would expand the current program from the 21 elementary schools it now serves to all 148 elementary schools in the district, and from the current 24 high schools to an additional 6.

- Providence: Used its $61,000 federal allocation in 1987-88 to purchase instructional materials, video tapes and pamphlets, contract with local community agencies to provide counseling for students, conduct teacher training, hold parent education workshops, and establish an intervention and referral system for school staff. Allocation to the public school system in 1988-89 will increase to $73,000.

  How Providence Would Use Additional Federal Money: Would expand all of the program's current components, while placing added emphasis on intervention, treatment and referrals.

- Salt Lake City: Used all of its $63,795 1987-88 federal allocation on direct services, i.e. no funds were spent on administrative salaries. Sent first proposal to state in June, 1987; began program technically on August 1, but did not draw down first payment until October. The bulk of the first year's allocation was not drawn down until June, 1988, when expenditures were being reimbursed. Funds went for purchasing "Here's Looking At You 2000" curriculum packages, after-care support classes for students, and one week student team

training. As part of the after-care support classes, the school system worked with about thirty young people who were transitioning back into school after their drug treatment. Transition classes involved homework, life and coping skills, decision-making sessions, and support groups.

How Salt Lake City Would Use Additional Federal Funds: Would use additional funds to train teachers in primary prevention, to expand the availability of drug-abuse curriculum, and to expand student assistance, transition and support services.

- Norfolk: Used its 1987-88 federal allocation of $87,000 to run teacher training programs and graduate courses for teachers in drug abuse topics. About 160 teachers and counselors took the federally-funded courses last year. The district also used its funds to establish "Just Say No" Clubs, run student and parent retreats, set up drug coordinators at all five district high schools, and purchase curriculum materials.

  How Norfolk Would Use Additional Federal Funds: Would expand graduate training courses for the balance of the 1000 teachers in the system, and implement more parent drug education classes.

- Buffalo: Used its federal allocation in the 1987-88 school year to purchase curriculum materials for teachers, to place part-time drug-abuse coordinators in high schools, to integrate drug education into the required health education class, to conduct in-service teacher training workshops, and to design drug education and prevention classes for students.

  How Buffalo Would Use Additional Federal Funds: Would expand training and coordinators into the elementary grades, and would purchase more materials for teachers.

- St. Louis: Used its approximately $1°3,000 federal grant in 1987-88 for in-service training in four grade modules: preschool, elementary grades K-5, middle grades 6-8, and high school grades 9-12. The district also operates in-service training for extended high schools and alternative schools. Training is focused on teachers, counselors and nurses. In addition, the district operated classes for students in drug abuse across all grade levels. Preschool efforts focused on the parents of preschool children at 28 sites.

  How St. Louis Would Use Additional Federal Funds: Would place more full-time drug abuse coordinators and trainers into high schools, and would purchase more training materials.

- Albuquerque: Used its $216,000 federal allocation in 1987-88 to hire 2.5 full-time central-office drug abuse coordinators for the school system, and to make a series of minigrants of $1800 a piece to 11 high schools, of $900 to 23 middle

schools, and $450 to 75 elementary schools. Elementary schools used most of the funds for audiovisuals, materials and incentives, while upper grades spent most of funds on in-service teacher training, stipends and speakers. The system also spent $23,000 of its allocation for Q.U.E.S.T. curriculum and training packages.

How Albuquerque Would Use Additional Federal Funds: Would hire program coordinators for each high school in the district to give the program a more human touch.

* Source: Council of the Great City Schools

Federal Drug Free Schools Allocations to Great City Schools

City School System	1987-88	1988-89
Albuquerque	$	$
Atlanta		
Baltimore	296,896	
Baton Rouge	162,854	190,000
Boston	367,907	207,063
Buffalo		
Chicago	1,217,664	1,217,664
Cincinnati	131,920	183,142
Cleveland	226,228	245,584
Columbus		
Dade County	631,856	769,058
Dallas	347,375	377,400
Dayton	77,676	95,256
Denver	166,727	176,868
Detroit	507,767	527,848
El Paso	41,935	
Fresno		
Houston	502,799	528,672
Indianapolis	161,514	161,514
Long Beach	104,201	175,986
Los Angeles	409,883	1,317,000
Memphis	281,401	318,915
Milwaukee		200,000
Minneapolis	98,338	117,604
Nashville	180,077	210,330
New Orleans	244,368	299,283
New York	2,300,000	3,300,000
Norfolk		
Oakland		
Omaha	58,517	245,786
Philadelphia	427,6897	519,353
Phoenix	126,282	
Pittsburgh	93,511	141,000
Portland	252,997	178,998
Rochester		
St. Louis	231,013	167,679
St. Paul	90,470	104,000
San Diego	32,532	26,845
San Francisco	137,402	216,386
Seattle	141,414	138,614
Toledo	119,560	243,694
Tuscon	130,133	144,018
Tulsa	148,915	159,520
Wake County	127,126	161,081
Washington, DC	417,600	662,138
Totals	$10,994,545	$13,728,299